Meeting of the MPO Board
Tuesday, January 8, 2019, 9:00 a.m.
Hillsborough County Center, 601 E. Kennedy Blvd., 26th Floor

Watch the HTV live-stream. Send comments in advance on Facebook.*

I. Call to Order, Pledge of Allegiance & Invocation

II. Approval of Minutes – December 4, 2018

III. Public Comment - 3 minutes per speaker, 30 minutes total; as needed, additional time may be provided later in the agenda.

IV. Committee Reports, Online Comments (Gena Torres, MPO Staff)

V. Consent Agenda
   A. Committee Appointments
   B. It’s Time Tampa Bay Survey Findings & Guidance for the 2045 Plan – approved by Policy Committee
   C. Health in All Policies Resolution – approved by Policy Committee
   D. Initiate a Comprehensive Safety Audit Addressing Speed Management – approved by Policy Committee

VI. Action Items
   A. FDOT Tentative Work Program & MPO Comments (FDOT Representative)
   B. MPO Representation in White v. Hillsborough County et. al. (Cameron Clark, MPO Attorney)

VII. Status Reports
   A. Smart Cities Initiatives: Tampa (Vik Bhide, City of Tampa)
   B. Resilient Tampa Bay: Transportation Pilot Project (Allison Yeh, MPO Staff)
   C. MPO Bylaws Amendment (Beth Alden, MPO Director)

VIII. Executive Director’s Report
   A. Special workshop for MPO Board, committees and public on the TBARTA Regional Planning Best Practices Study: January 15th, 5pm, 26th Floor
   B. Open House meeting on FDOT responses to MPO Board information requests from 2016 & 2017 TIP hearing motions: date to be announced
   C. Next Board meeting: February 5, 9am, 26th Floor, and TMA Leadership Group meeting: February 8, 9:30am, 18th Floor

IX. Old & New Business
X. Adjournment

XI. Addendum

A. Upcoming Events
   - RESCHEDULED: Cleveland Elementary School Mural Painting
   - Gasparilla Children's Parade Bicycle & Pedestrian Safety Rodeo

B. Project Fact Sheets
   - North 62nd Street, from CSX Intermodal Entrance to Columbus Drive

C. Correspondence
   - To FDOT: MPO Comments on Strategic Intermodal System 2045 Cost Feasible Plan & MPO Support for I-275/SR 60 Interchange
   - From FDOT District 7: Response to MPO Comments on Strategic Intermodal System 2045 Cost Feasible Plan
   - From FDOT District 7 on Chamberlain High School and MPO School Safety Study
   - From TBARTA on Local Funding and Accomplishments
   - To the Institute of Transportation Engineers on Road to Zero Speed Management Training Workshop
   - From FDOT District 7, biweekly traffic fatality list, Nov. 5-18
   - From FDOT District 7, biweekly traffic fatality list, Nov. 19-Dec. 2
   - From FDOT District 7, biweekly traffic fatality list, Dec. 3-16

D. Articles Relating to MPO Work
   - West Tampa residents take to Facebook to ask for sidewalks and safer streets
   - Hillsborough, Pinellas to get $2M to better connect USF and fund transit oriented development
   - Hillsborough County looking at ways to get drivers to stop speeding
   - 10 Tampa Bay area road projects that will make your life easier in 2019
   - Tampa Bay's hot business stories for 2019 include flood insurance and bridge overhauls
   - Officials want dramatic overhauls for Fowler Ave, Busch Blvd

E. Miscellaneous
   - To Predict with Confidence, Plan for Freedom – Jarrett Walker
   - Don’t Ask When Self-Driving Cars Will Arrive – Ask Where
Florida Chamber summit: Embracing tech key to solving transportation woes

The full agenda packet is available on the MPO’s website, www.planhillsborough.org, or by calling (813) 272-5940.

The MPO does not discriminate in any of its programs or services. Public participation is solicited without regard to race, color, national origin, age, sex, religion, disability or family status. Learn more about our commitment to non-discrimination.

Persons needing interpreter services or accommodations for a disability in order to participate in this meeting, free of charge, are encouraged to contact Johnny Wong, 813-273-3774 x370 or wongj@plancom.org, three business days in advance of the meeting. Also, if you are only able to speak Spanish, please call the Spanish helpline at (813) 273-3774, ext. 211.

Si necesita servicios de traducción, el MPO ofrece por gratis. Para registrarse por estos servicios, por favor llame a Johnny Wong directamente al (813) 273-3774, ext. 370 con tres días antes, o wongj@plancom.org de cerro electrónico. También, si sólo se puede hablar en español, por favor llame a la línea de ayuda en español al (813) 273-3774, ext. 211.

In accordance with Title 17 U.S.C. Section 107, materials attached are for research and educational purposes, and are distributed without profit to MPO Board members, MPO staff, or related committees or subcommittees the MPO supports. The MPO has no affiliation whatsoever with the originator of attached articles nor is the MPO endorsed or sponsored by the originator. Persons wishing to use copyrighted material for purposes of their own that go beyond ‘fair use’ must first obtain permission from the copyright owner.

If a person decides to appeal any decision made by the board, he or she will need a record of the proceedings, and for such purpose may need to ensure that a verbatim record of the proceedings is made, which record includes the testimony and evidence upon which the appeal is to be based.
MPO Board Meeting of Tuesday, December 4, 2018

CALL TO ORDER, PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE & INVOCATION

The MPO Chairman, Commissioner Les Miller, called the meeting to order at 9:00 a.m., led the pledge of allegiance and gave the invocation. The regular monthly meeting was held at the County Center in the 26th Floor Conference Room.

The following members attended:


The following member was absent:

Mayor Rick Lott.

WELCOME NEW MEMBERS

Chairman Miller welcomed new MPO Board members, Commissioner Kimberly Overman and Commissioner Mariella Smith.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES – October 30, 2018

A motion was made by Commissioner Kemp to approve the minutes of October 30, 2018. The motion was seconded by Councilman Cohen and carried unanimously.

PUBLIC COMMENT

Mr. Joseph Lugo explained an idea, called Tampa Bay Area Regional Connector System (TRACS), that he has for mass transit for the Tampa Bay community.

Following Mr. Lugo’s comments, Chairman Miller requested that Mr. Lugo provide his information in writing to staff.

Ms. Kim DeBosier, Greater Tampa Chamber of Commerce Transportation Council Co-Chair, spoke in support of funding the Tampa Bay Next Westshore Interchange Project.

Mr. Tom Nocera, representing St. Pete Tampa Aerial Transit, LLC and Beach Tran Clearwater, LLC requested again an opportunity to make a presentation at a future meeting on new technology developed by SkyTran. He only needs seven to eight minutes to make the presentation to the board.
Ms. Michelle Cookson, representing Sunshine Citizens and Old Seminole Heights Neighborhood Association, recommended transit now mobility choices, effective transportation solutions and people first as the MPO’s priority for Hillsborough County residents.

Mr. Chris Vela distributed a map of Brightline’s proposal that will impact Ybor neighborhoods and reminded members of the SEIS process for the TB Next Project.

Mr. Rick Fernandez, President of the Tampa Heights Civic Association and Vice-Chair of the MPO’s CAC, brought to the board’s attention an action taken by the CAC regarding agenda item VIII. C. It’s Time Tampa Bay Survey Results. Though the results of the survey currently show low public support for the I-275 boulevard conversion, it is likely due to a lack of understanding by the public and the concept warrants further study.

Following Mr. Fernandez’s comments, Commissioner Kemp asked for clarification of the committee’s vote, which was 12 for approving the survey results and recommendations and 3 against.

Mr. Michael Maurino spoke on behalf of the Westshore Alliance in support of the Westshore Interchange as a regional priority and requested that letters of support be forwarded to FDOT.

Ms. Christine Acosta, representing Walk Bike Tampa the nonprofit advocacy organization, as well as Pedal Power Promoters, and a founding member of the Vision Zero Coalition, urged the board to make the Westshore Interchange the County’s top priority and to make the community transit ready.

Mr. Joshua Frank talked from a personal perspective about the intersection of Adamo Drive and Orient Road, It’s Time Tampa Bay Survey boulevard results, and Commissioner White’s decision to sue to prevent All for Transportation.

Ms. Lena Young Green thanked the board for representing constituents and their interests, and echoed comments regarding the survey and Tampa Heights being considered for interstate boulevard conversion. She requested the board recognize the value of the urban core and continue working on walkable/bikeable communities and Vision Zero.

Ms. Dayna Lazarus, USF Urban Planning Master’s Student and CAC member, would like to see the County put more money into lower income neighborhoods, consistency in HART service, and connection of streets that are usually underfunded. She hopes for investment in light rail.

COMMITTEE REPORTS, ONLINE COMMENTS

Mr. Rich Clarendon, MPO Assistant Executive Director, presented the committee reports for Gena Torres. Committees approved and forwarded to the MPO Board: (1) the 2019 Committees and MPO Board Meeting Schedule, (2) the Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) amendment for HART’s FTA Section 5337 & 5339 funding, (3) MPO comments on the FDOT Strategic Intermodal System 2045 Cost Feasible Plan, with agreement that the I-275/ SR 60 interchange is a top priority; the TAC recommended adding the I-275 to I-4 flyover as a top priority as well; (4) the It’s Time Tampa Bay Survey results and recommendations. The CAC discussed the Boulevard conversion concept, suggesting that it was not being clearly understood by the public, and still warrants further study (motion passed 12-3); other committees asked how the results would be used in developing the 2045 Long Range Transportation Plan (LRTP).

The committees received the following presentations:

- The Health in All Policies Resolution. Questions were raised about how the indicators would be used in the LRTP prioritization process and if additional indicators could be considered such as
air quality, access to hospitals by medical professionals and urban tree canopy. MPO staff is working to address the concerns and the item will be brought to the MPO at a later meeting.

- Southshore Transit Reevaluation
- The Heights Mobility Plan
- MPO Multimodal Level of Service Evaluation
- Gasparilla Children’s Bike Rodeo
- Noise Wall Best Practices

All committees were invited to attend the Cleveland Elementary School mural painting day on Saturday, December 15, being held at 723 East Hamilton Avenue.

The TMA Leadership Group discussed possible restructuring options since there is no longer a facilitator. Discussion included options for voting structure; asking staff to draft bylaws and include a clarification of roles and responsibilities; and to consider a slogan for the group. The It’s Time Tampa Bay MetroQuest regional survey results were reviewed. The MPOs shared their major comments regarding the Strategic Intermodal System Cost Feasible Plan for 2045 and will provide letters to FDOT. Secretary Gwynn requested support for the Westshore/I-275 Interchange as the number one regional priority. The next Tampa Bay Transportation Management Area Leadership Group will take place on February 8th and will be held in the Planning Commission Board Room on the 18th floor of the County Center.

The Facebook comments and electronic comments received from citizens were also summarized for the board, and copies of the comments in full were provided to board members in their meeting folders.

**CONSENT AGENDA**

A. Committee Appointments
B. 2019 MPO Board & Committees Meeting Calendar

A motion was made by Councilman Cohen to approve the Consent Agenda. The motion was seconded by Hillsborough County School Board School Member Stuart and carried unanimously.

**ROLL-CALL VOTE: TIP Amendment for HART FTA Section 5307, 5309-5337 & 5339 Funding Approved by Committees**

There were no questions regarding the item. Upon a roll call vote, the motion carried fifteen to zero.

**ACTION ITEMS**

A. 2019 MPO Board Officers & Committee Representatives

As a precursor to the discussion, MPO Vice Chair Councilman Cohen announced that he will be rotating off the MPO Board in March, and also will no longer serve on the TMA Leadership Group 2019. He encouraged members to consider serving on the TMA Leadership Group and stressed the importance of the three Hillsborough MPO delegates to attend regularly, to participate and hear from regional partners. Although time consuming, it is important that the Hillsborough voice is heard. Councilman Cohen referenced the lawsuit related to the All for Transportation referendum and was disappointed that the will of Hillsborough County voters could be infringed by that effort. He suggested moving forward with the funding that people overwhelmingly supported.

Chairman Miller thanked Councilman Cohen for his service to the City and Hillsborough County.
Mr. Cameron Clark, MPO Attorney, requested nominations for MPO Chair and Vice Chair.

Commissioner Kemp nominated Commissioner Miller as the MPO Chair, and there were no other nominations. Mr. Clark announced that Commissioner Miller is the MPO Chair.

Mr. Lopano nominated Councilman Viera as Vice Chair. Commissioner Smith nominated Commissioner Kemp as Vice Chair.

By a show of hands (Lopano, Stuart, Jurado, Viera, Cohen, Mechanik, and Waggoner) there were seven votes for Councilman Viera.

By a show of hands (Klug, Maniscalco, Miller, Kemp, Smith, Overman, Hagan, and Green) there were eight votes for Commissioner Kemp.

Commissioner Kemp was announced as the Vice Chair.

Commissioner Kemp, Councilman Maniscalco, and Joe Waggoner were reappointed to serve on the Policy Committee. Commissioner Smith and Cindy Stuart volunteered to serve on the committee filling the two vacant seats. Commissioner Overman volunteered to serve as an alternate, and Mr. Anderson will continue to serve as an alternate.

Commissioner Kemp, Commissioner Overman, and Councilman Viera agreed to serve on the TMA Leadership Group. The group meets every other month, approximately five times a year, and the meeting location rotates. With there being two alternate seats on the TMA, Mr. Klug wanted to know if membership is now limited to elected officials. Ms. Alden stated that a decision has not been made; however, there was discussion on that topic at the group’s last meeting. Mr. Klug suggested that only elected officials serve as alternates for the leadership group. Attorney Clark stated that if the group changes its makeup, a change could be made at that time; membership is at the MPO Board’s discretion. Following discussion, Mr. Lopano and Mr. Anderson remained in the alternate positions; changes will be made later if necessary.

Councilman Viera was willing and honored to continue serving as the Chair of the Transportation Disadvantaged Coordinating Board.

Planning Commissioner Green was willing to remain the Livable Roadways Committee Chair.

The MPOAC representative, per the bylaws, is the MPO Chair, with the Vice Chair performing those duties in the Chair’s absence. Florida Statute also requires designation of an alternate to the Chair, and currently Mr. Paul Anderson holds the position. Mr. Klug stated that Mr. Anderson is willing to continue to serve as the alternate representative to the MPOAC.

A motion was made by Councilman Cohen confirming the 2019 MPO Board Officers and Committee Representatives. The motion was seconded by Hillsborough County School Board Member Stuart and carried unanimously.

B. Unified Planning Work Program (UPWP) Amendment

Mrs. Allison Yeh, MPO Staff, provided an overview of the FY 2019 UPWP amendment. The UPWP outlines major planning tasks for federal and state funding effective July 1, 2018 through June 30, 2020 and coordinates federally funded planning tasks performed by the MPO, HART & FDOT. The MPO periodically processes amendments to the UPWP to account for changes to tasks, funding and budget. Today’s amendment is to reconcile the budget estimates with actual grant awards and grant close-out balances from last fiscal year.
Following the presentation, Commissioner Overman wanted to know how the MPO measures the effectiveness of crash data. Ms. Alden stated that staff provides quarterly updates on the Vision Zero initiative to track crash trends over time and supplements that information by looking at the effectiveness of individual improvement projects, using crash modification factor tools that are available from the Federal Highway Administration.

A motion was made by Councilman Maniscalco to approve the FY 19 & FY 20 UPWP Amendment and forward to FDOT for approval. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Overman and carried unanimously.

C. It’s Time Tampa Bay Survey Results & Recommendations

(Commissioner Hagan left at 10:01)

Ms. Lisa Silva, MPO Staff, introduced the action item. Mr. Jim Meyer, AECOM, MPO Consultant gave a presentation on the survey results, which will assist the three MPOs in moving forward to develop a hybrid scenario of future growth and transportation. Next year, there will be additional outreach, with the adoption of the LRTP to come in the fall. The detailed report and PowerPoint is available on the Plan Hillsborough website at http://www.planhillsborough.org/2045-lrtp/, as well as the http://itstimetampabay.org/ website.

Following the presentation, Commissioner Kemp observed that 10,000 surveys were completed. Mr. Meyer stated that just under 10,000 surveys were completed, of which a little over 4,000 were completed for Hillsborough County. Commissioner Kemp felt that with those numbers, the survey was not reflective enough of Hillsborough, as a share of the regional voice. She would like to see Hillsborough’s responses separated out to get a better picture.

Ms. Alden provided a point of clarification and stated that some survey respondents did not provide their zip code. When looking at people who did provide their zip, the percentage of people from Hillsborough County was over-represented in the region.

Commissioner Overman commented on the I-275 boulevard conversion and reinforced the recommendation to revisit the response -- just for Hillsborough -- and see if there would be a different type of weighting. She would like to keep this topic on the agenda going forward.

Mr. Meyer stated that the overall report does show that Hillsborough has a slightly higher approval of the boulevard scenario.

Ms. Alden said that a presentation slide is available, with the counties separated out to show their responses to the transportation elements. Staff will bring the information back if members are interested.

Ms. Cindy Stuart reminded the group that there were a lot of distractions when the survey was conducted. All for Transportation and the School District were running referenda, and she felt that people were not interested in completing another survey; therefore, the results were impacted. She commented that 4,000 surveys representing the entire county was dismal.

Councilman Cohen felt that the survey was done well, and the report is easy to understand. He believes the results should be taken with a grain of salt because when talking with people in the community, there are very different levels of knowledge about transportation options and it is difficult for people to evaluate some of the concepts.

Mayor Mel Jurado echoed Mrs. Stuart’s and Councilman Cohen’s comments. She felt that the data was lacking on school transportation issues, crash mitigation and public safety issues.
Mr. Meyer agreed with the comments and stated that the survey was a regional high-level survey.

(Mr. Mechanik left at 10:26)

Mr. Green echoed previous comments and thanked staff and AECOM for conducting the survey. Mr. Green was concerned that the Livable Roadways Committee’s recommendation from its last meeting was not captured in the report. Ms. Lisa Silva stated that the meeting was after the production of the MPO agenda material, and the committee’s recommendation was provided verbally during the Committee Reports by Mr. Clarendon. Mr. Green stated that some members of the community and he had concerns about the pairing of scenarios in the survey. For example, ferry service and boulevard in Tampa does not register a lot for Pasco County residents.

Mr. Waggoner stated that the survey was a qualitative survey and was not backed by analysis. He looks forward to the analysis being done in the future to provide details of what is needed.

Councilman Viera stated that the overall message from the survey is regardless of where people come from, they want elected officials to make robust investments in transportation options right here and right now.

Following the lengthy discussion, Chairman Miller stated that it is apparent that more information is wanted about Hillsborough County residents’ responses, and he referred the item to the Policy Committee for further review. Staff will email board members to clarify the specific information members would like to receive regarding the It’s Time Tampa Bay Survey results. The information will be provided to the Policy Committee for discussion, and the item will come back to the January MPO meeting. There were no objections to the Chair’s recommendation.

D. MPO Comments on Strategic Intermodal System (SIS) 2045 Cost Feasible Plan

Ms. Sarah McKinley, MPO Staff, presented agency comments on the FDOT SIS 2045 Cost Feasible Plan for the tri-county area of Hillsborough, Pasco, and Pinellas Counties. The SIS network consists of roadways of regional significance. Some of the projects within Hillsborough County include interchange improvements along I-275 north of Downtown Tampa and I-75 at Gibsonton Drive and Big Bend Road. The SR 60/Memorial interchange in the Westshore district is included with construction funding beyond Fiscal Year (FY) 2029. There are capacity projects along US 41 near the Port of Tampa and SR 60 in eastern Hillsborough County.

During committee review, the Technical Advisory Committee recommended to include the I-275 to I-4 Flyover as a top priority for funding sooner. Staff suggests that since the board has not yet seen the SEIS recommendations for the Downtown Interchange, that the comment should be left out for now.

Following Ms. McKinley’s presentation, Chairman Miller asked Secretary David Gwynn if he was involved with the agenda item since his name appeared on the agenda coversheet. Secretary Gwynn stated FDOT will provide a response to the MPO’s comments; a letter will be forthcoming.

Commissioner Kemp wanted to know if the letter would be like the one provided at the HART Board meeting. He stated that it’s not the same letter, it will be a formal response to the MPO’s comments on the 2045 SIS Plan.

Ms. Alden stated that there were two proposed letters in the MPO agenda material.

Secretary Gwynn stated that FDOT has worked with the County to move the Big Bend I-75 interchange project forward, and that the plans for the Gibsonton interchange are being worked out and that information
will be provided in the letter as well.

Mr. Green was going to make a motion to approve the MPO’s two letters for transmittal. Chairman Miller stated we should wait until the response letter is received from Secretary Gwynn. Ms. Alden clarified and stated that staff needs the board’s approval to transmit the comment letter that was included in the agenda material to Secretary Gwynn; it reflects the comments provided in Sarah’s presentation. The second proposed letter supports funding the SR 60/I-275 (Westshore) Interchange in an earlier year, as was discussed at the TMA Leadership Group with support for identifying it as a top regional priority.

Mr. Green suggested deferring the letter to Secretary Gwynn and moving forward with the letter to FDOT Secretary Mike Dew regarding the Westshore Interchange Reconstruction.

Chairman Miller asked Secretary Gwynn to provide the Tampa Bay Next update, and then the board will resume discussion of the letters.

Secretary Gwynn offered to meet with new board members if necessary. He provided the quarterly update.

Discussions have taken place with Brightline regarding right of way use for their project. FDOT will meet with Brightline regarding details, and negotiations continue. The Brightline proposal is available on FDOT’s website.

FDOT has continued to meet with the community. There are two operational improvements that are ongoing: (1) the addition of a lane on SR 60 near the Veterans Expressway to assist with a bottleneck, and (2) the punch through project near the Howard Frankland bridge going from four to three lanes and merge lanes are being extended. The Howard Frankland Bridge RFP will be released on December 10, and the construction is scheduled for 2020 – 2024.

During the presentation, Commissioner Kemp inquired about the outside shoulder merger of the lanes for I-275 north of Downtown Tampa. Secretary Gwynn stated the area has experienced a lot of crashes, and they are trying to clear up the bottlenecks.

Commissioner Kemp wanted to know the percentage the area accounts for in terms of crash issues. Secretary Gwynn did not have the information available.

The Westshore Interchange (I-275/SR 60) is not currently funded and is not in the five-year work program. The Secretary has received support from the TMA, Pinellas BOCC & Forward Pinellas, Pasco County BOCC & MPO, and HART. PSTA will provide a letter of support soon. FDOT is requesting support from TBARTA as well. The Secretary would like to go to Tallahassee with support stating that the region does not want to wait five years to begin the project. The project will provide direct express lane connection to the Tampa International Airport and can assist in developing a transit corridor. The Secretary asked for support from the Hillsborough MPO on the Westshore Interchange Reconstruction as a number one regional priority.

Questions were taken on Secretary Gwynn’s update.

Councilman Cohen provided a personal commentary about the Howard Frankland Bridge and stated that he felt the original TBX passed because the Howard Frankland Bridge project was included and viewed as critical for the region. He is totally in support of the Westshore Interchange project. He wants the aesthetics of the new bridge to give the region identity and character, similar to the Skyway Bridge. He proposed that Hillsborough and Pinellas compete on design ideas to capture the spirit of the community on each side of the Bay.

Commissioner Overman inquired about AADT growth rates. Secretary Gwynn stated that it was average
daily traffic, how many cars would utilize the road each way daily. Ms. Sarah McKinley stated that the model forecast of future AADT was based on population, employment, and origin and destination data for single occupancy vehicles. Commissioner Overman inquired about where Segment 4 ends. Secretary Gwynn stated that it ends at the Westshore Interchange.

Mr. Lopano stated that the project is critical for the airport to continue to grow.

Commissioner Kemp suggested looking at historical trends for traffic at the Westshore Interchange, and expressed concerns regarding Segment 5. She would like to have a greater comfort level about the project’s implications for Segment 5 before transmitting the letter.

Commissioner Miller asked for confirmation that Secretary Gwynn was requesting a letter of support to for additional funding for the Westshore Interchange Reconstruction. Secretary Gwynn agreed. Secretary Gwynn clarified the lane merger at the Howard Frankland Bridge and stated that he and his staff are willing to meet with any board member and provide clarification about Segment 5. Originally Segments 4 and 5 were planned to be built together, but now only the portion of 5 that is needed to make sure that a bottleneck is not created at Westshore is being built.

Chairman Miller advised Secretary Gwynn if any member of the board would like to meet with him, that he and his staff should sit down with them to address concerns. Secretary Gwynn agreed.

**Mr. Lopano made a motion to approve and transmit the letter to District 7 Secretary David Gwynn: Comments on SIS 2045 Cost Feasible Plan, and the letter to FDOT Secretary Mike Dew: Westshore Interchange Reconstruction. The motion was seconded by Mr. Joseph Waggoner.**

Commissioner Smith pointed out that there is still a SEIS to be completed for Segments 4 and 5. The letter does not commit the group to being unable to make changes to the SEIS. There are still questions regarding how to handle the express lanes regarding tolled or untolled. This will be settled once the SEIS moves forward and is finalized. Secretary Gwynn stated that FDOT will follow the SEIS as approved. Commissioner Smith stated that she likes the MPO’s proposed letters better than HART’s letter because of the sentence that states that further development of the project design will provide the detailed information that is necessary.

**Following the discussion, the motion carried unanimously.**

**EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR’S REPORT**

Ms. Alden has been reviewing the language of the County Charter Amendment regarding transportation funding and the MPO’s role. One percent of the proceeds is set aside for planning and development, that the MPO would receive for supporting the work of the implementing agencies and to support the Independent Oversight Committee. A meeting has been scheduled with the implementing agencies for an initial discussion. Ms. Alden will provide an update in February and address how this may affect the budget and work program for the MPO.

There will be a TBARTA MPOs Chairs Coordinating Committee on December 14 in Sarasota to review the regional priority list.

The next board meeting will be held Tuesday, January 8th on the 26th floor of the County Center.

**OLD & NEW BUSINESS**

Mr. Klug announced a major historical development for Port Tampa Bay, with the addition of COSCO Shipping Gulf of Mexico Express Transpacific service commencing January 28, 2019. COSCO Shipping
is one of the world’s largest container carriers with services calling at 267 ports in 85 countries and regions throughout the globe and will provide weekly direct service from Asia to Tampa.

**ADJOURNMENT**

There being no further business, the meeting adjourned at 11:15 a.m.
Committee Reports

Joint Meeting of the Citizens & Technical Advisory Committees (CAC-TAC) on December 17

The current officers were reelected to serve in 2019:

- CAC Chair – Bill Roberts; Vice Chair – Rick Fernandez; Officer at Large – Nicole Rice
- TAC Chair – Jeff Sims; Vice Chair – Mike Williams; Officer at Large – Amber Dickerson

The committees approved and forwarded to the MPO Board:

- FDOT Tentative Work Program & MPO Comments, with a request from the CAC for more information on projects that are deferred;
- Speed Management & Safety: A Data-Driven Approach, with a recommended action that the MPO sponsor a comprehensive safety audit, addressing speed management, focusing on the severe crash corridors in Hillsborough County;
- Multimodal Level of Service Evaluation, with the CAC suggestion that we monitor the usage of bicycle and pedestrian facilities once they are built.

The CAC-TAC received updates on Tampa Bay Next and Resilient Tampa Bay.

Meeting of the Policy Committee on December 12

The committee approved and forwarded to the MPO Board:

- It’s Time Tampa Bay Survey Results & Recommendations, after a detailed presentation on the responses of Hillsborough County residents specifically, including variations of opinion among demographic segments and geographic sub-areas of the county; there was also a long discussion of the need for more kinds of highway capacity expansion projects than were asked about in the survey, a topic which can be explored later this spring during traffic modeling/forecasting for the 2045 Transportation Plan;
- Speed Management & Safety: A Data-Driven Approach, with a recommended action that the MPO sponsor a comprehensive safety audit, addressing speed management, focusing on the severe crash corridors in Hillsborough County;
- Health in All Policies Resolution

The Policy Committee also was briefed on:

- FDOT Tentative Work Program;
MPO Bylaws Amendment, to add a TDCB seat as required by the State of Florida, and to establish a code of conduct for MPO advisory committee members similar to the Planning Commission’s or Florida Senate’s.

Meeting of the Bicycle/Pedestrian Advisory Committee (BPAC) on December 12
The committee **approved and forwarded to the MPO Board:**
- FDOT Tentative Work Program
- October 2019 Meeting Calendar Amendment

The BPAC also:
- Heard an update on the proposed relocation of a portion of the Upper Tampa Bay Trail, and made a motion offering to review future requests to relocate trails, if the MPO Board or County Commission so desires.
- Approved a list of questions to be submitted to candidates for Mayor of Tampa.

The BPAC received updates on Multimodal Level of Service and Tampa Bay Next.

Meeting of the Transportation Disadvantaged Coordinating Board (TDCB) on December 14
The committee **approved and forwarded to the MPO Board:**
- Election of officers: reelecting Gloria Mills as Vice Chair and Craig Forsell as Officer At Large;
- By-Laws Amendment to include membership from the Agency for Persons with Disabilities as required by the Florida Administrative Code;
- Continued Coordination Contract with Sunrise Community Inc.; 171 persons with cognitive disabilities were provided with trips to job opportunities, day training programs and social events in the last calendar year at a cost of $14.09 per trip;
- The South Shore Transit Study Reevaluation.

Meeting of the Livable Roadways Committee (LRC) on December 19
The committee **approved and forwarded to the MPO Board:**
- FDOT Tentative Work Program
- Multimodal Level of Service Evaluation
- Speed Management & Safety: A Data-Driven Approach, with a recommendation to develop comprehensive safety and speed management action plan, including safety audits to include speed management and the importance of network connectivity

The LRC also received reports on:
- Tampa Bay Next Update
- Smart Cities Initiative
Meeting of the School Transportation Working Group (STWG) on December 5

The STWG celebrated its last meeting in this format, with refreshments, and members shared successes. The group members also discussed their transition to working as part of the FDOT Community Traffic Safety Team.

The STWG received status reports on:
✓ Statewide Directors Sub-Committee meeting – F.S. Hazardous Walking Legislation Proposed Revisions
✓ Draft Elementary Student Non-Funded Phased Bus Removal TECO Electric Bus Pilot Project
✓ Draft Elementary Student Non-Funded Phased Bus Removal
✓ USF Industrial Engineering School Magnet School Transportation Pilot Program
✓ School District’s Circulation Committee
✓ Multimodal Level of Service Evaluation

Following the meeting, several members joined the National Safe Routes to Schools Partnership Executive Director, Cass Isidor, for a brainstorming season to generate ideas for the November 2019 national conference in Tampa.
Board & Committee Agenda Item

**Agenda Item**
Committee Appointments

**Presenter**
None – Consent Agenda

**Summary**
The Livable Roadways Committee (LRC) shall be responsible for integrating Livable Roadways principles into the design and use of public rights-of-way and the major road network throughout Hillsborough County. The LRC seeks to accomplish this responsibility by: making recommendations to create a transportation system that balances design and aesthetics with issues of roadway safety and function; ensuring that public policy and decisions result in a transportation system that supports all modes of transportation, with a special emphasis on pedestrian and bicycle infrastructure and transit infrastructure and service. The following individuals have been nominated by their organizations:

- Peter Syzonenko, American Institute of Architects, Alternate
- Larry Josephson, Hillsborough County Public Works, Member; Richard Rank, Alternate
- Matthew Lewis, Hillsborough County Development Services, Member; Ben Kniesly, Alternate

**Recommended Action**
That the MPO confirm the above appointments

**Prepared By**
Wanda West

**Attachments**
None
Board & Committee Agenda Item

**Agenda Item**

It’s TIME Tampa Bay Survey Findings & Guidance for the 2045 Plan

**Presenter**

Lisa K. Silva, MPO Staff

**Summary**

It’s TIME Tampa Bay is a collaboration of the Metropolitan Planning Organizations (MPOs) of Hillsborough, Pasco, and Pinellas counties. Federal law requires MPOs to evaluate trends, project future growth, gauge public preferences, and identify fiscally constrained multimodal transportation investments for the next 20 years as part of their Long Range Transportation Plan (LRTP) updates. The Hillsborough MPO’s next major update of the LRTP is due in November 2019.

It’s TIME Tampa Bay is an initial step in preparing this 2045 LRTP, by seeking public feedback on three alternative scenarios of future growth and major transportation investments. This is the first time that Hillsborough, Pinellas, and Pasco MPOs have collaborated to create tri-county scenarios of growth and transportation on consistent themes, such as transit-focused, technology-focused, etc.

The MPOs also collaborated to get broad feedback from the public, using an online survey tool called MetroQuest. The survey was distributed and widely publicized through August and September, and more than 9500 responses were received. The survey provided citizens the opportunity to weigh in on priorities; on the exaggerated future-year scenarios of growth and transportation system improvements; and on a variety of types of roadway and transit projects, and community and funding strategies. The results of the survey will help the MPOs identify good ideas, projects, and policies to carry forward into the next phase of the LRTP, and evaluate further.

The next step is to prepare a “hybrid” scenario, combining some of the favorably-rated elements of the three alternative scenarios. The survey results suggest the following elements and ideas be carried forward.

**Survey findings and guidance for the 2045 Plan**

- The MPOs should encourage local governments to include, in their comprehensive plans, policies that:
  - Reinvest in neighborhoods
  - Strengthen downtowns, and create more downtown-like places
  - Minimize outward growth

- Rail transit was very favorably rated, and options for incorporating rail in the 2045 Transportation Plan should be considered. Possibilities include:
• Brightline to Orlando and other Florida metro areas
• Tampa Streetcar
• Other rail or fixed-guideway transit services
• The survey also suggests rail should connect to express bus and BRT services, which were favorably rated although not as highly as rail.

• The elevated express lane concept was favorably rated and should continue to be explored. It may be a cost-effective strategy in land-constrained areas such as:
  o Possible strategy for Downtown Tampa interchange (i.e. alternatives C & D)
  o Possible strategy for SR 54/US 41 interchange area in Pasco
  o Also, tolls should be used primarily for congestion management rather than for raising revenue

As an additional note, regional express lane connections between Downtown Tampa and Pasco should be explored only on I-75 and I-4, not on I-275, in order to be consistent with last summer’s Hillsborough MPO board motion eliminating express lanes from I-275 north of Downtown Tampa.

• New and expanded interchange ramps were rated favorably; improvements targeted at interchanges should continue to be explored.

• Walk and bike modes are important to include and address.

• Public support is not currently present for converting portions of I-275 to a street-level boulevard. The concept may not be well understood at this time. It drew negative feedback, including from Hillsborough County and Tampa residents.

• The 2045 Plan will need to demonstrate how technology advances can be implemented realistically and safely; questions and concerns were raised.

During the December MPO board meeting, members asked for more information regarding: Hillsborough-specific results; if the survey addressed safety; and the I-275 Boulevard concept. The Policy Committee discussed these topics in detail and approved the survey findings and guidance on December 12.

**Recommended Action**

Approve *It’s TIME Tampa Bay* Survey Findings & Guidance for the 2045 Plan, as described above

**Prepared By**

Lisa K. Silva, AICP, PLA, MPO Staff

**Attachments**

2045 Tri-County Transportation Plan Results Summary Report
2045 Survey Comments Appendix
Health in All Policies

Resolution

Presenter
Michele Ogilvie, MPO Staff

Summary
Good health begins in the places where we live, learn, work and play. Although medical care is critically important, things like the quality of our schools, affordability and stability of our housing, access to good jobs with fair pay, and the safety of our neighborhoods can keep us healthy in the first place. (Robert Woods Johnson Foundation, 2015).

Public health and urban planning are quite interconnected where the urban environment clearly influences the health and wellbeing of individuals. At the beginning of the 20th Century, we learned how a series of issues including industrialization, lack of sanitation, rapid urbanization, inadequate water supplies and waste collection, high levels of pollution and lack of control measures, and inadequate housing for the poor could cause the spread of disease and unhealthy environments. Our understanding of how planning can affect health outcomes has grown to include health impacts such as obesity, asthma, cardiovascular disease and cancer.

Transportation does more than just move us around. Transportation is a critical factor that influences people’s health and the health of a community. Investment in sidewalks, bike lanes, trails, public transit, and other infrastructure that supports physical activity can result in improvements to individuals’ health and decreased health care costs.

Health in All Policies (HiAP) is an approach to planning whereby decision-makers consider how plans and policies will impact human health. Health in All Policies is a collaborative way to connect and integrate health considerations in policies or system practice.

Key HiAP principles include promoting health, equity and sustainability; supporting inter-sectoral collaboration; benefitting multiple partners; engaging stakeholders; and creating structural or procedural change. The Department of Health - Hillsborough County with the Metropolitan Planning Organization and Planning Commission staffs have developed a Transportation and Health Indicators Matrix which highlights agency cross-sectoral alignments.
At the MPO’s direction, the Department of Health, Planning Commission and MPO staff have also prepared a report analyzing the land use and transportation linkage for potential impacts of costs, growth, and other implications of the proposed Resolution.

The MPO Committees have reviewed the proposed Resolution, Matrix and Report and their recommendations are as follows:

- Policy Committee: Unanimous recommendation for approval.
- Technical Advisory Committee: Discussed the need to highlight Air Quality as an Indicator. Unanimous recommendation for approval.
- Citizens Advisory Committee: Unanimous recommendation for approval.
- Livable Roadways: Discussed the need to highlight Air Quality as an Indicator. Unanimous recommendation for approval.
- Bicycle Advisory Committee: Unanimous recommendation for approval.

**OUTCOME:** The Transportation and Health Indicators Matrix, line 7 has been revised to highlight Air Quality as discussed by the Technical and Livable Roadways Committees.

**Recommended Action**
That the MPO adopt the *Health in All Policies* Resolution

**Prepared By**
Michele Ogilvie, MPO Staff

**Attachment**
*Health in All Policies* Resolution, letter of support from the Florida Department of Health, and background report
RESOLUTION establishing a Health in All Policies approach to Transportation Planning.

WHEREAS, the Hillsborough County Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO) is the designated and constituted body responsible for the transportation planning and programming process for Hillsborough County; and

WHEREAS, the MPO desires to promote, maintain and enhance the livability of unincorporated Hillsborough County, Plant City, Tampa and Temple Terrace; and

WHEREAS, policy, planning and programming decisions made by non-health agencies significantly impact social and environmental factors and health, and can have a disproportionate impact on vulnerable populations; and

WHEREAS, Health in All Policies is a cross-sector collaborative approach that incorporates health into the decision-making process of government agencies; and

WHEREAS, an individual's zip code and conditions in the environment where they live, work, learn and play have a greater impact on an individual's health and quality of life than their genetic code; and

WHEREAS, making community conditions more equitable, including roadway safety and connectivity to resources and public transportation, improves health equity; and

WHEREAS, communities of color, lower income individuals, older adults, persons with disabilities, children at risk and individuals and communities who are pedestrian, bicycle and public transportation-dependent experience higher rates of health disparities, preventable differences in health status and outcomes resulting from social and environmental factors and historic policy decisions; and

WHEREAS, the Hillsborough Metropolitan Planning Organization seeks to provide transportation system wide choices for all users including motorists, bicyclists, pedestrians, and transit users, and to make unincorporated Hillsborough County, Plant City, Tampa and Temple Terrace more livable, healthy, and economically robust.

NOW, THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED by the Hillsborough Metropolitan Planning Organization that:

1. The Hillsborough MPO will continue to work with the Florida Department of Health in Hillsborough County (DOH-Hillsborough) to implement Health in All Policies strategies taking into account the health impacts of MPO decisions that include but are not limited to chronic and acute health outcomes, mental and physical wellbeing, health behaviors such as physical activity, measures of social cohesion and community connectedness, access to healthcare, employment and educational opportunities and the environment.

2. The MPO will consider and report the health impacts based on the Transportation and Health Indicators Matrix (attached)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MPO PRIORITY AREA</th>
<th>INDICATORS</th>
<th>HEALTH PRIORITY AREA*</th>
<th>MPO PERFORMANCE OUTCOMES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Crash &amp; Vulnerability Reduction/Investment for Economic Growth</td>
<td>Recovery time for critical transportation links after a Category 3 storm</td>
<td>All</td>
<td>Regional Scenario</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Crash &amp; Vulnerability Reduction</td>
<td>Total crashes reduced, fatal crashes reduced, bicycle/pedestrian crashes</td>
<td>HE, LHL, AC, CD</td>
<td>TIP, LRTP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Crash &amp; Vulnerability Reduction</td>
<td>Number street lights installed in high crash corridors</td>
<td>All</td>
<td>TIP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Crash &amp; Vulnerability Reduction</td>
<td>Number of miles of sidewalk present in high pedestrian crash areas/ complete</td>
<td>All</td>
<td>LRTP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Crash &amp; Vulnerability Reduction</td>
<td>Pedestrian intersection improvements (example-high visibility crosswalks,</td>
<td>HE, LHL, AC, CD</td>
<td>TIP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ADA compliant sidewalks, median pedestrian refuge and bulb-outs) 1/4 mile</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>from transit stops</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Minimize Congestion</td>
<td>Pedestrian friendly intersections for Communities of Concern</td>
<td>HE, LHL, AC, CD</td>
<td>TIP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Minimize Congestion</td>
<td>Air Quality: Population or households adjacent (500 feet) to congested or</td>
<td>CD, HE, LHL</td>
<td>Regional Scenario</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>high-volume roads (30,000 ADT or a volume to capacity ratio of 1.0 or greater)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. System Preservation/Investment for Economic Growth</td>
<td>Span and frequency of transit service</td>
<td>HE, LHL, AC, CD</td>
<td>TIP; LRTP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. System Preservation/Investment for Economic Growth</td>
<td>Highway centerline miles within 1/2 miles of major healthcare (hospitals),</td>
<td>BH, CD, HE</td>
<td>Regional Scenario; LRTP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>recreation (regional parks, entertainment venues), education (universities and</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>colleges)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Investment for Economic Growth/Real Choices</td>
<td>Transit and sidewalk coverage to areas of Essential Destinations (map</td>
<td>All</td>
<td>TIP; LRTP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>attached)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Investment for Economic Growth/Real Choices</td>
<td>Ratio of sidewalk and/or bicycle lanes to roadway miles in the Urban Service</td>
<td>HE, LHL, AC, CD</td>
<td>LRTP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Investment for Economic Growth/Real Choices</td>
<td>Transit and sidewalk coverage to behavioral health and chronic disease</td>
<td>All</td>
<td>LRTP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>services</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Real Choices when Not Driving</td>
<td>Miles of sidewalk and trails present within 1/4 mile of populations identified</td>
<td>AC, IM, BH, CD</td>
<td>TIP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>with high rates of behavioral health and chronic disease conditions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Real Choices when Not Driving</td>
<td>Sidewalk coverage (both side of street) within 1/4 mile of transit stops</td>
<td>LHL, HE</td>
<td>LRTP; TIP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Real Choices when Not Driving</td>
<td>Sidewalk coverage (both side of street) for block groups within 1/4 mile of</td>
<td>LHL, CD, BH, HE</td>
<td>Regional Scenario; TIP; LRTP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>restorative and social activities, e.g. parks, recreation, and community</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>centers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. Real Choices when Not Driving</td>
<td>Transit service route miles within 1/4 miles of high proportion of elderly</td>
<td>HE, LHL, AC, CD</td>
<td>LRTP; TIP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>population (over 500 per square mile)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. Real Choices when Not Driving</td>
<td>Percent of Environmental Justice population living within 1/4 mile of a</td>
<td>All</td>
<td>Regional Scenario</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>trail/side path</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. Real Choices when Not Driving</td>
<td>Transit and sidewalk coverage within designated USDA Food Deserts</td>
<td>All</td>
<td>TIP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. Real Choices when Not Driving</td>
<td>Percent of Community of Concern population living within 1/4 mile of transit</td>
<td>HE, LHL, AC, CD</td>
<td>TIP; LRTP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>service (map attached)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*AC- Access to Care; BH- Behavioral Health; CD- Chronic Disease; HE- Health Equity; LHL- Long Healthy Life; IM- Infant Death
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April 11, 2018

Commissioner Les Miller, Chairman
Metropolitan Planning Organization Board
601 E. Kennedy Blvd
Tampa, FL 33602

RE: Transportation and Health

Dear Mr. Miller and Members of the Metropolitan Planning Organization Board:

On behalf of the Florida Department of Health in Hillsborough County, we are thrilled to support the Hillsborough County Metropolitan Planning Organization’s (MPO) recent work showing the links between transportation and health. Their work reflects a growing recognition that community health depends on all community partners, including partners that influence the physical and built environments in which we live.

The conditions of the places where people live, learn, work, and play that affect overall health are the social determinants of health. These social determinants include transportation factors like air quality, the availability of sidewalks, trails, crosswalks, lighting, public transit, where major and minor corridors are placed, and who has access to them or who is affected by them. In some locations, transportation policies and decisions have had major negative impacts on entire communities, affecting long-term economic opportunities and asset building, which ultimately affects health. Health outcomes that can be affected by transportation decisions include problems like poor mental health, chronic diseases like overweight and obesity, and decreased length of life, among others.

Health in All Policies is a collaborative strategy for improving the health of communities by incorporating health considerations into decision-making across sectors and policy areas. We encourage adoption of the MPO resolution establishing Health in All Policies as an approach to transportation planning. This approach, adopting the resolution, and using the supporting health indicators matrix will help planners prioritize projects that mirror other growth, sustainability, and vibrancy leaders across the country. We welcome the opportunity to continue working with the MPO on Health in All Policies projects to increase the health and livability of Hillsborough County.

Sincerely,

Douglas Holt, M.D.
Director
Florida Department of Health in Hillsborough
Communities of Concern measure more than one standard deviation above the county’s median in two or more characteristics: low income, disability, youth, elderly, limited English proficiency, minorities, and carless households.

Extreme Poverty 85 percent or more of households have an annual household income of $37,000 or less.
Center for Urban Transportation Research (2016) - Evaluating the Distributional Effects of Regional Transportation Plans and Projects
Health in All Policies Resolution Report

INTRODUCTION

This report is in response to two motions made by first, the Policy Committee and second by the MPO Board.

1. Motion: Councilman Cohen moved to request staff work with the Health Department to research and draft health in all policies resolution, seconded by Commissioner Murman. After remarks, the motion carried five to zero. (POLICY COMMITTEE- 8/30/16)

2. After sharing potential capital/operating concerns and wanting to see municipal/County/PC feedback, Commissioner White moved to send that to the County administration, the administration of the three municipalities, and the PC, to look at the land use and transportation linkage for potential impacts of costs, growth, and any other implications, and have that resolution come back accompanied by a report on that review for the MPO’s consideration at that time, seconded by Commissioner Kemp, and carried eleven to zero. (MPO BOARD- 5/1/18)

CONTEXT

Good health begins in the places where we live, learn, work and play. Although medical care is critically important, things like the quality of our schools, affordability and stability our housing, access to good jobs with fair pay, and the safety of our neighborhoods can keep us healthy in the first place. (Robert Woods Johnson Foundation, 2015).

Public health and urban planning are quite interconnected where the urban environment clearly influences the health and wellbeing of individuals. At the beginning of the 20th Century, we learned how a series of issues including industrialization, lack of sanitation, rapid urbanization, inadequate water supplies, waste collection, high levels of pollution and lack of control measures, and inadequate housing for the poor could cause the spread of disease and unhealthy environments (Kenzer, 2000). Our understanding of how planning can affect health outcomes has grown to include health impacts such as obesity, asthma, cardiovascular disease and cancer.

Health in All Policies (HiAP) is an approach to planning whereby decision-makers consider how plans and policies will impact human health. Key HiAP principles include promoting health, equity and sustainability; supporting inter-sectoral collaboration; benefitting multiple partners; engaging stakeholders; and creating structural or procedural change (Rudolph, Caplan, Ben-Moshe, & Dillon, 2013). The Department of Health - Hillsborough County with the Metropolitan Planning Organization and Planning Commission staffs have developed a health priorities matrix which highlights agency cross-sectoral alignments from ongoing HiAP work.

DEFINITIONS:

Public Health is the science of increasing the health and safety of communities through education, policy making and research for disease and injury prevention.
Health in All Policies is a collaborative way to connect and integrate health considerations in policies or system practice.

Health is a state of complete physical, mental and social well-being and not merely the absence of disease or infirmity.

Transportation does more than just move us around. Transportation is a critical factor that influences people’s health and the health of a community. Investments in sidewalks, bike lanes, trails, public transit, and other infrastructure that supports physical activity can result in improvements to individuals’ health and decreased health care costs.

SOCIAL DETERMINANTS OF HEALTH:
Social determinants of health are conditions in the environments in which people are born, live, learn, work, play, worship, and age that affect a wide range of health, functioning, and quality-of-life outcomes and risks. By working to establish policies that positively influence social and economic conditions and those that support changes in individual behavior, we can improve health for large numbers of people in ways that can be sustained over time. Improving the conditions in which we live, learn, work, and play and the quality of our relationships will create a healthier population, society, and workforce.

THE PROBLEM - TRANSPORTATION’S IMPACT ON HEALTH:
The Hillsborough County Transportation Disadvantaged Service Plan reports that nearly 1/3 of the population of Hillsborough County is Transportation Disadvantaged (TD). 'Transportation disadvantaged' means those persons who because of physical or mental disability, income status, or age are unable to transport themselves or to purchase transportation and are, therefore, dependent upon others to obtain access to health care, employment, education, shopping, social activities, or other life-sustaining activities, or children who are handicapped or high-risk or at-risk as defined in Florida Statute 411.202."

Transportation systems can provide access to physical activity opportunities, improve safety, lower emotional stress, link poor people to opportunity, connect isolated disabled and older Americans to crucial services and social supports and stimulate economic development.

Elderly and disabled populations drive less and therefore must rely more on other transportation options to get around: More than 1 in 5 Americans age 65 and older do not drive. More than 50% of elderly non-drivers (3.6 million Americans) stay home on any given day in part due to lack of transportation options and more than half of this group (1.9 million) is disabled. Older non-
drivers take 15% fewer trips to the doctor; 59% fewer trips to shops and restaurants; and 65% fewer trips for family, social and religious activities than their counterparts who drive. (CITYLAB- Older People Will Need Much Better Transit, August 2017)

- Transportation costs create a barrier for many: U.S. households earning $20,000 to $35,000 and living far from employment centers, spend approximately 37% of their income on transportation, while the average U.S. household spends about 18% of its income on transportation. The more a household spends on transportation, the less it has left over for food, medical expenses, childcare, housing and other essential costs. (AARP- Waiting for a Ride: Transit and America’s Aging Population, 2011)

In Hillsborough County the concentrations of residents living in households with no vehicles are in areas greater than the median (5 percent), those that are one standard deviation above the median (15 percent), and those that are two standard deviations above the median (26 percent).

The Hillsborough County Transportation Disadvantaged Service Plan reports that the lack of continuous sidewalks and bicycle facilities impact a TD individual’s ability to navigate transportation corridors in a comfortable and safe manner. Issues that impact comfortable and safe travel include:

- Overall access impacted by poles, benches, or other elements blocking the clear space on sidewalks, especially for persons who make use of wheelchairs, scooters, or other mobility aids.
- Varying widths of sidewalks and bike lanes
- Incomplete sidewalk systems and bicycle facility network.
- The mismatch of sidewalks, bike lanes, and transit stops.
- Problematic intersections due to:
  - High traffic volume,
  - Large number of turning movements at an intersection’
  - Lack of pedestrian signalization

These factors are barriers to pedestrian and bicyclist safety and put an undue stress on the TD population. These barriers were confirmed as a result of the 2016 TDSP Human Services Transportation Survey and Forum. Eighty percent of the respondents said that their clients walk and 60 percent of the respondents stated that their clients bike. It is known that every fixed-
route transit rider is either a pedestrian or a bicyclist at the beginning and end of each trip. Lack of coordination between pedestrian and bicycle infrastructure with the needs of the TD community is a barrier to providing safe and efficient travel for the TD population.

It is well established that physical activity promotes longevity and is beneficial for health (CDC, 2011; CDC, 2015b; American Heart Association [AHA], 2015). Access to an active living system can improve a community’s health through promoting physical activity and recreational activity while reducing poor health outcomes. An active living system that is used for commuting can help to reduce cardiovascular risk by 11%, increase daily steps, and increase time spent walking (American Public Health Association, 2010). Researchers have correlated communities that report higher rates of walking and cycling to work with more daily physical activity and lower rates of obesity and diabetes (Pucher, Buehler, Bassett, & Dannenberg, 2010). Cycling and walking have been recognized as an important means to promote health since they are the most common forms of physical activity as well as active transport. An increase of one-hundred minutes of cycling per week, reduces the mortality risk by 10% when compared to non-cyclists (Schepers et al., 2015). An increase of one-hundred and sixty-eight minutes of walking per week, reduces the risk of early mortality by approximately 11% (Schepers et al., 2015).

Providing safe streets for all users is an important component of a healthy and economically vibrant community. Pedestrian and bicycling infrastructure improvements (such as wayfinding, crosswalk improvements, wider sidewalks, lighting) to connect to transit and transit-oriented development can provide large but often overlooked health benefits. Studies have shown that 43 percent of people with safe places to walk within ten minutes of home achieve their daily physical activity targets, compared to just 27 percent for residents of less walkable areas achieving physical activity targets. (Littman, 2010).

Transit supportive infrastructure improvements can be achieved with the implementation of Complete Streets policies. Complete Streets is a set of policies and planning practices intended to ensure that roadways accommodate all users and uses including walking, cycling, transit and
automobile travel. Complete Streets are designed with its community context- in a rural setting a Complete Street will look much different than a Complete Street in an urban setting.

Roadways traditionally have been designed primarily for motor vehicles. A personal vehicle-centric design approach potentially could pose barriers to use by pedestrians, bicyclists and public transportation users, thus limiting active transportation opportunities and potential resulting health benefits. Complete Streets policies can support planners and engineers in developing roadway designs that improve the safety of all users and provide additional opportunities for physical activity from transportation. The connections between physical activity and public health have been widely documented. Research suggests that physically active adults “have lower rates of all-cause mortality, coronary heart disease, high blood pressure, stroke, type 2 diabetes, metabolic syndrome, colon cancer, breast cancer, and depression” than their physically inactive peers (U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, 1996). Active transportation, or trips made by walking or bicycling, was identified by Healthy People 2020 as a target for measuring progress for healthier people (U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, 2010). Additionally, Healthy People 2020 listed “increased legislative policies for the built environment that enhance access to and availability of physical activity opportunities” as a specific travel and transportation policy.

Active transportation and physical activity is more likely to occur in places with a variety of land uses, a comprehensive network of pedestrian, bicycle, and public transportation facilities, inviting street design for all users, and safety measures; and Complete Streets policies address all four of those factors (Fenton, 2012). Complete Streets also promote increased roadway connectivity, which has been shown to reduce VMT per capita (Moreland-Russell et al., 2013), and they have been found to improve safety and mobility for pedestrians and bicyclists (U.S. DOT, 2010; Handy, Tal, Boarnet, 2010).

Shifts towards using Complete Streets provide a measure of how approaches to planning and engineering are shifting over time. The focus of road design is no longer about auto-mobility but creating an overall network that serves all users (LaPlante, McCann, 2011). Complete Street policies are a component of the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC) transportation recommendations. Complete Streets can enhance physical activity and reduce injury. Setting a Complete Streets policy in place is a foundational step towards improving infrastructure by providing accessible, safe, and connected roadways (CDC, 2010).

A recent survey of implemented Complete Street policies suggests this type of strategy is applicable to communities that vary in geography and socio-demographic factors (Marshall, Garrick, 2011), which suggests that it can be a useful tool for various regions. Complete Streets strategies include retrofitting existing arterials to accommodate multi-modal users or building new facilities that support multi-modal transportation and complementary roadside uses. Complete Streets elements may include pedestrian and bicyclist accommodations, public transportation access, accommodations for persons with disabilities, landscape elements, and traffic calming. Controlling and reducing vehicular speed can be done through reducing the number of lanes, adding curb parking, or installing raised medians (LaPlante, McCann, 2011). Decision makers can search the National Complete Streets Coalition Policy Atlas for model
language and for other assistance in developing Complete Streets policies. This is an opportunity for health and transportation professionals to work with advocates and decision makers in setting forth policy strategies to shape the future of land use, growth, and development in ways that encourage use of alternate modes and opportunities for physical activity from transportation, while enhancing safety for all users. Enhanced health and safety of the broader population is tightly connected with the built environment and small steps now can lead to significant benefits in the future. (FHWA)

**HEALTH INDICATORS:**
A growing body of scientific evidence has shown that the built environment can have significant effects on both physical and mental health, particularly among minority and low-income populations already burdened with disproportionate rates of illness and morbidity. The combination of lack of infrastructure (e.g., sidewalks, bike paths, and parks), affordable housing, and supermarkets with access to healthy food increases the risks of both physical and mental illnesses.

The conditions of the place where people live, learn, work and play that affect overall health are the determinants of health. These social determinants include transportation factors like air quality, the availability of sidewalks, trails, crosswalks, lighting, public transit, where major and minor corridors are placed, and who has access to them or is affected by them. In some locations, transportation policies, and decisions have had major negative impacts on entire communities, affecting long term economic opportunities and asset building, which ultimately affects health. Health outcomes that can be affected by transportation decisions include problems like poor mental health, chronic diseases like overweight and obesity, and decreases length of life.

Health data can provide a picture of current health conditions, trends and disparities within any community. This information can help inform planners and community leaders on the best ‘infrastructure’ solutions for their communities and can allow them to track how changes to the built environment are helping or harming their communities.

In 2017, the Hillsborough County MPO created a Health Atlas web-based mapping tool to provide a baseline context of health and health-related indicators within Hillsborough County as well as to visualize the interconnectedness of health, transportation, economic development, and the environment.
The catalyst for the Health Atlas is the MPO’s involvement in the Healthiest Cities & Counties Challenge. The Challenge is a partnership between the Aetna Foundation, the American Public Health Association, and the National Association of Counties. The partnership has “challenged” 50 cities and counties to create a positive health impact through a small seed money grant. Hillsborough County’s Challenge project is called Garden Steps; the purpose being to establish community gardens in food deserts within Tampa, as a case study, evaluating transportation conditions surrounding sites.

The Health Atlas provides a baseline profile for obesity and chronic illness such as asthma, cardiovascular disease, and diabetes within Tampa neighborhoods, as well as demographic, transportation, health care access, food environment, emergency preparedness, and environmental indicators which span Hillsborough County. Health practitioners report that in the United States, chronic diseases such as diabetes and cardiovascular disease, are on the rise. The built environment has become an important aspect of health-promotion strategies. Health is viewed as not merely the absence of disease or infirmity, but also includes “a state of physical, mental, and social well-being”. Well planned and designed transportation investments can go beyond a primary purpose of moving people to positively influencing the future health of communities and the residents, workers, and businesses.

Ingredients of our HiAP also include aging, disability, safety and access to jobs, schools, health care, healthy food and recreation.

**THE HEALTH IN ALL POLICIES MATRIX:**
As part of this process, Hillsborough MPO staff worked with partners at FDOH – Hillsborough to determine a list of indicators to monitor the performance of our transportation system with regard to health outcomes and supporting healthy behaviors. This was accomplished through the comparison of FDOH – Hillsborough’s Community Health Improvement Plan (CHIP) and the priorities outlined in the MPO Long Range Transportation Plan (LRTP).

In coordination with the performance measures in the 2040 LRTP, the TIP Priorities consider candidate projects that fall into one of the five investment programs, ranked in the following order per criteria established in the LRTP:

1. Preserve the System, including projects such as:
a. Bridge repair & replacement  
b. Road resurfacing  
c. Transit vehicle replacement

2. Reduce Crashes & Vulnerability, including safety and resilience projects evaluated by their effect on:  
   a. Total, fatal & bike/ped crashes  
   b. Recovery time & economic impacts from flooding or major storm surge

3. Manage Congestion for Drivers & Shippers, including intersection, signalization, freeway incident management and ITS projects, evaluated by their impact on:  
   a. Travel time reliability on heavily congested arterials  
   b. Peak period V/C ratio

4. Real Choices When Not Driving, including alternatives such as transit, multi-use trails and services for the transportation disadvantaged, evaluated by:  
   a. Density of jobs and population in 2040 within ¼ mile of proposed transit service  
   b. Density of jobs and population in 2040 within ¼ mile of proposed trail/sidepath

5. Major infrastructure improvements, including road and transit capacity projects for economic growth:  
   a. Key economic spaces (job clusters > 5,000)  
   b. 2040 jobs served per mile of improvement  
   c. 2040 delay reduced per mile of improvement

To ensure continuity with previous priorities, any project already programmed for construction funding is given priority over new candidates for funding.

The TIP also incorporates projects prioritized by the Tampa Bay Transportation Management Area (TMA, which includes the Hillsborough, Pasco and Pinellas MPOs) Leadership Group and the TBARTA CCC for inclusion in the 2040 Regional LRTP. It also includes priority projects for the Transportation Regional Incentive Program (TRIP) authorized through state legislation.

The CHIP includes the six major health concerns for the county, which are:

- Access to Care  
- Behavioral Health  
- Chronic Diseases  
- Health Equity  
- Long Healthy Life  
- Infant Death.

Where these priorities intersected, staff looked at models in other communities to track performance, then compared those to existing data sources available in Hillsborough County. Staff then narrowed that larger list of indicators to those that most directly impact health outcomes and where data is readily available. The result is a list of 19 indicators/performance
measures. These will be tracked over time to measure the performance of transportation investments as related to the health of the community.

The measures were chosen to represent a wide cross section of the importance of transportation in health outcomes, including vulnerability to natural disasters, vehicle crashes, walkability, access to care, access to daily needs, access for vulnerable populations, and safety. These measures also include the MPO priority areas as well as in the application to the MPO’s plans and programs.

### Transportation and Health Indicators Matrix

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MPO PRIORITY AREA</th>
<th>INDICATORS</th>
<th>HEALTH PRIORITY AREA*</th>
<th>MPO PROGRAM APPLICATION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Crash &amp; Vulnerability Reduction/Investment for Economic Growth</td>
<td>Recovery time for critical transportation links after a Category 3 storm</td>
<td>All</td>
<td>Regional Scenario</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Crash &amp; Vulnerability Reduction</td>
<td>Total crashes reduced, fatal crashes reduced, bicycle/pedestrian crashes reduced</td>
<td>HE, LHL, AC, CD</td>
<td>TIP, LRTP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Crash &amp; Vulnerability Reduction</td>
<td>Number of street lights installed in high crash corridors</td>
<td>All</td>
<td>TIP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Crash &amp; Vulnerability Reduction</td>
<td>Number of miles of sidewalk present in high pedestrian crash areas/complete network</td>
<td>All</td>
<td>LRTP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Crash &amp; Vulnerability Reduction</td>
<td>Pedestrian intersection improvements (example-high visibility crosswalks, ADA-compliant sidewalks, median pedestrian refuge and bulb-outs)</td>
<td>HE, LHL, AC, CD</td>
<td>TIP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Minimize Congestion</td>
<td>Pedestrian friendly intersections for Communities of Concern</td>
<td>HE, LHL, AC, CD</td>
<td>TIP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Minimize Congestion</td>
<td>Population or households adjacent (500 feet) to congested or high volume roads (100,000+ ADT or a volume to capacity ratio of 1.5 or greater)</td>
<td>CD, HE, LHL</td>
<td>Regional Scenario</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. System Preservation/Investment for Economic Growth</td>
<td>Span and frequency of transit service</td>
<td>HE, LHL, AC, CD</td>
<td>LRTP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. System Preservation/Investment for Economic Growth</td>
<td>Highway centerline miles within 1/2 miles of major healthcare (hospitals, recreation (regional parks, entertainment venues), education (universities and colleges)</td>
<td>BH, CD, HE</td>
<td>Regional Scenario; LRTP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Investment for Economic Growth/Real Choices</td>
<td>Transit and sidewalk coverage to areas of Essential Destinations (map attached)</td>
<td>All</td>
<td>TIP; LRTP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Investment for Economic Growth/Real Choices</td>
<td>Ratio of sidewalk and/or bicycle lanes to roadway miles in the Urban Service Area</td>
<td>HE, LHL, AC, CD</td>
<td>LRTP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Investment for Economic Growth/Real Choices</td>
<td>Transit and sidewalk coverage to behavioral health and chronic disease services</td>
<td>All</td>
<td>LRTP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Real Choices when Not Driving</td>
<td>Miles of sidewalk and trails present within 1/4 mile of populations identified with high rates of behavioral health and chronic disease conditions</td>
<td>AC, IM, BH, CD</td>
<td>TIP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Real Choices when Not Driving</td>
<td>Sidewalk coverage (both side of street) within 1/4 mile of transit stops</td>
<td>LHL, HE</td>
<td>LRTP; TIP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Real Choices when Not Driving</td>
<td>Sidewalk coverage (both side of street) for block groups within 1/4 mile of restorative and social activities, e.g., parks, recreation, and community centers</td>
<td>LHL, CD, BH, HE</td>
<td>Regional Scenario; LRTP; TIP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. Real Choices when Not Driving</td>
<td>Transit service route miles within 1/4 miles of high proportion of elderly population (over 500 per square mile)</td>
<td>HE, LHL, AC, CD</td>
<td>LRTP; TIP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. Real Choices when Not Driving</td>
<td>Percent Environmental Justice population living within 1/4 mile of a trail/path</td>
<td>All</td>
<td>Regional Scenario</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. Real Choices when Not Driving</td>
<td>Transit and sidewalk coverage within designated USDA Food Deserts</td>
<td>All</td>
<td>TIP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. Real Choices when Not Driving</td>
<td>Percent of Community Concern population living within 1/4 mile of transit service (map attached)</td>
<td>HE, LHL, AC, CD</td>
<td>TIP; LRTP</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*AC- Access to Care; BH- Behavioral Health; CD- Chronic Disease; HE- Health Equity; LHL- Long Healthy Life; IM- Infant Death

**HEALTH AUDIT:**

For its LRTP update, scheduled for completion in 2019, the Hillsborough MPO and Health Department staffs are interested in expanding its approach to identifying and addressing the transportation needs of the Transportation Disadvantaged (TD) in the region. The MPO staff, through their previous planning and public involvement efforts, indicated a need for a greater variety of analysis measures and methods to better define and locate TD and Community of Concern groups (COCs), as well as accessibility of pedestrians, cyclists and transit-users to jobs.
and services. A Community of Concern is a census block group that has a high proportion of two or more protected classes, such as racial minorities, low-income groups, persons with disabilities, and those with limited English proficiency. The MPO further indicated interest in methods to evaluate public health, safety and the distributional equity of investments.

To begin, we needed to know how do existing planning documents perform when viewed through a health lens? To answer this question, we analyzed three Imagine 2040 documents: Long Range Transportation Plan (LRTP), Projects Prioritized for Funding, and the FY 19-23 Transportation Improvement Program (TIP). They were examined for how they addressed health concerns. As we pursue a Health in all Policies through transportation planning approach, this information is a baseline for measuring progress.

**Key Findings:**

**TIP:** Nearly $439 million will be spent in the next five years to support healthy behaviors. Over the next five years, dollars will continue to be spent to improve walking, biking. Local and state governments are implementing projects to improve safety, increase access and mobility, maintain air quality standards and promote economic development. This is 11% of the $1.55 billion we are spending on transportation infrastructure. These funds will increase walking, biking, and transit opportunities.

**Analysis of Existing Priorities Funded for Construction** shows that jurisdictions are submitting projects that increase opportunities to walk, bike, or use transit. 41 of the 54 projects advanced from the LRTP in 2018/2019 supported one or more health indicators. HART continues to plan for an expanded, reliable and frequent public transit system. In the current TIP, we spend $685,556,302 on transit, which is 16.99% of total funding. To determine money spent on the transit components in the TIP, projects with a transit component were selected, including those for capital purchases, maintenance, operations, equipment, pilot projects, vanpools, and administration. This amount was then divided by the total money allocated in the TIP for all funding.

To determine funding with a pedestrian or cycling component, all projects with a pedestrian or cycling component were selected. These include trails, sidewalk programs, bridge replacements with a pedestrian or cycling component, new roads incorporating cycling and pedestrians, roadway expansions that will include multimodal facilities, enhancements to existing multimodal facilities, traffic calming projects, complete streets projects, ADA projects, and intersection projects with a pedestrian safety component. This list includes all phases of a project including, planning, engineering, design, and construction. The total was then divided by the overall TIP funding.

This study provides the MPO with potential methods and measures for identifying COCs and more systematically monitoring the long-term impacts of the regional plan and projects, using indicators related to affordability, accessibility and safety. Results of the study were presented to various MPO committees and the MPO Board to help inform future planning efforts.
The Hillsborough MPO is now using this equity analysis to screen TIP projects for impacts and benefits to COCs. In particular, the MPO is identifying areas with low access to food and other services, such as healthcare, and using additional tools, such as health impact assessments, to prioritize projects to help COCs facing these challenges. The 2045 update to the MPO Long Range Transportation Plan and Title VI plan will include details from, and expansion of, this equity analysis. Other projects include a recently concluded Transportation Disadvantaged Summit, which brought together providers and recipients to discuss transportation disadvantaged needs.

**PROJECT EVALUATION:**
As an example of how this might be used in the prioritization of projects for funding in the Transportation Improvement Program (TIP), staff has applied the health indicators matrix performance measures to two projects already funded in the TIP. While this is not intended to replace the existing TIPP prioritization process, it can help identify projects that have health benefits.

**Sulphur Springs Elementary Safe Routes to School**
The Sulphur Springs Elementary Safe Routes to School project identifies a number of elements including high visibility crosswalks and filling sidewalk gaps around the school, which is also in an area of high chronic disease and has been identified as a Community of Concern. Applying the indicators in the Health Matrix to this project, the following indicators are met:

- Indicator 2 – Total crashes reduced
- Indicator 4 – Number of miles of sidewalk present
- Indicator 5 – Pedestrian Intersection Improvements
- Indicator 6 – Pedestrian friendly intersections for COCs
• Indicator 11 – Ratio of Sidewalk and/or bicycle lanes to roadway miles in the Urban Service Area
• Indicator 13 – Miles of sidewalk present within ¼ miles of populations with high rates of chronic health conditions
• Indicator 14 – Sidewalk coverage within ¼ mile of transit stops
• Indicator 15 – Sidewalk coverage for block groups within ¼ mile of restorative and social activities
• Indicator 18 – Sidewalk coverage within designated food deserts

This total of 9 out of 19 measures could then be compared against other projects to determine which may have the greatest health benefits for the community.

Morris Bridge Road
This project is proposed to add paved shoulders, sidewalks, and a multi-use trail to connect existing pedestrian and bicycle facilities north and south of the project. It also offers safety improvements for all users including motorists and can improve active transportation options, thereby helping in the reduction of chronic diseases in the long-term. In this case, the following indicators are met:
• Indicator 2 – Total crashes reduced
• Indicator 4 – Miles of sidewalk present
• Indicator 5 – Pedestrian Intersection Improvements
• Indicator 11 – Ratio of sidewalk and/or bicycle lanes to roadway miles in the Urban Service Area

With four out of 19 measures met, this project could be helped in prioritization by its performance on the health indicators.

LAND USE:
Transportation and land use are significant factors in the built environment that affect (a) rates of injury and death caused by traffic crashes, (b) ease and safety of physical activity, (c) air quality, (d) greenhouse gas emissions, and (e) access to key community resources such as health care and healthy food. Land-use policies pertain not only to the movement of people but also to the movement of freight and goods from ships through ports and on trucks and trains, which affects communities and workers across the country.

The FDOH staff has considered a pilot assessment for how the Tampa Comprehensive Plan (TCP) addresses health. The comprehensive plan is a locally adopted document designed to guide the future actions of a jurisdiction. It presents a vision for the future, with long-range goals, objectives and policies for all activities that affect the local government. This includes guidance on how to make decisions on public and private land development proposals. Plans are written to provide direction for future activities over a 20-year period after plan adoption.
The ChangeLab Solutions’ framework was ultimately chosen to evaluate the TCP. The Healthy Comprehensive Plan Assessment Tool (HCPAT) calls for utilizing keyword searches, within four health related domains: (1) Complete Streets, (2) Complete Neighborhoods, (3) Healthy Food Systems, and (4) Environmental Health. The FDOH staff also decided to compare the TCP to the Orlando Growth Management Plan (OGMP) as Orlando is a municipality similar in size and demographics to Tampa. The OGMP is also similarly structured with no stand-alone health element and containing approximately 600 pages and over 1,000 GOPs.

For the evaluation, two searches were conducted. The initial search identified goals, objectives and policies that contained key terms associated with the CLS health related domains. Additionally, OHE staff proposed additional terms to include in the initial search. Terms that were added by OHE staff were taken from the HiAP matrix developed during collaborative efforts between the MPO and DOH-Hillsborough previously, and relate specifically to transportation and local health priorities. The search was conducted on both the TCP and the OGMP. Terms used in the initial search from the CLS domains are included.

From this quantitative analysis, it is evident the TCP addresses health and substantiates the qualitative-findings made by Planning Commission staff earlier in 2018. Nevertheless, with the TCP format, readers are left to infer the priority of health within the plan, since it is dispersed in bits and pieces and not discussed directly as an over-arching theme or element. While it may be that integrating health throughout the TCP, as it is currently written, is preferable to authoring a stand-alone element, this format does make assessing the plan for the inclusion of health challenging. And, while certainly more is better than less, there are no established benchmarks or standards to guide planners and public health professionals on a sufficient number or ratio of health-related terms and references that are needed to address health within a plan.

In considering the TCP’s potential utility in impacting health within the community the authors conclude that it is not possible without additional methods of measurement. Other comprehensive plan analyses have performed similar quantitative assessments in the past and have noted the need for tracking effectiveness, plan performance, plan conformance, or impact over time as the true measure of a valuable comprehensive plan (Berke, Spurlock, Hes, & Band, 2013; Feitelson, Felsenstein, Razin, & Stern, 2017; Frew, Baker, & Donehue, 2016). Specifically, without understanding baseline health benchmarks or developing measurable goals, a comprehensive plan can have no real ability to deliver on its healthy vision.

In 2017 the Florida Department of Transportation (FDOT) released its Context Classification system. The context classification system broadly identifies the various built environments existing in Florida. FDOT’s context classification system describes the general characteristics of the land use, development patterns, and roadway connectivity along a roadway, providing cues.
as to the types of uses and user groups that will likely utilize the roadway. The context classification of a roadway will inform FDOT’s planning, PD&E, design, construction, and maintenance approaches to ensure that state roadways are supportive of safe and comfortable travel for their anticipated users. Identifying the context classification is a step-in planning and design, as different context classifications will have different design criteria and standards.

The context classification system supports in developing roadway designs that improve the safety of all users and provide additional opportunities for physical activity from transportation. The connections between physical activity and public health have been widely documented. Research suggests that physically active adults “have lower rates of all-cause mortality, coronary heart disease, high blood pressure, stroke, type 2 diabetes, metabolic syndrome, colon cancer, breast cancer, and depression” than their physically inactive peers (U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, 1996).

COSTS & ECONOMIC IMPACTS:
In 2011, the American Heart Association (AHA) published a review of more than 200 studies and concluded that most cardiovascular disease can be prevented or at least delayed until old age through a combination of direct medical care and community-based prevention programs and policies. Some of the key findings included:

- Every $1 spent on building biking trails and walking paths could save approximately $3 in medical expenses.
- For every $1 spent in wellness programs, companies could save $3.27 in medical costs and $2.73 in absenteeism costs.
- Some interventions have been shown to help improve nutrition and activity habits in just one year and had a return of $1.17 for every $1 spent.
- Participants in community-based programs who focused on improving nutrition and increasing physical activity had a 58 percent reduction in incidence of type 2 diabetes compared with drug therapy, which had a 31 percent reduction.

The Trust for America’s Health (TFAH) and the Robert Wood Johnson Foundation (RWJF) and conducted by the National Heart Forum (NHF) found that if Florida could reduce the average body mass index (BMI) of its residents by only 5 percent, the state could help prevent thousands of cases of type 2 diabetes, coronary heart disease and stroke, hypertension, cancer and arthritis, while saving millions of dollars. BMI, is used as a screening tool for overweight or obesity.
FDOT, Hillsborough County, its cities, and HART already spend considerable amounts on achieving positive health outcomes.

While walk/bike improvements are represented in the charts above as small percentages, other categories also go toward improving mobility for nonmotorized users. For example, Hillsborough County is installing modern cycling facilities such as separated trails, bike lanes with innovative intersection treatments, and sidewalks as they widen roads or extend new roads.

The City of Tampa has passed a Complete Streets policy where, as roads are resurfaced, they are evaluated for whether there is room to add bike lanes or other facilities that would benefit cyclists and pedestrians.

Even funds for bridges can contribute to these efforts, as Hillsborough County plans to add a trail with the reconstruction of the Maydell Bridge and FDOT has committed to the addition of a trail along the Howard Frankland Bridge when it is reconstructed in the coming years.

To summarize, the charts above contain greater walk/bike improvements than are documented specifically in those categories. Additional facilities are constructed using funds from the road widening, bridges and maintenance, and intersections/interchanges categories. These collectively make up 28.55% of the local agency capital improvements and 44.66% if the FDOT work program. That does not mean that nearly half of the funds spent by FDOT go toward nonmotorized improvements, but it does show a higher level of investment than the 0.77% that is identified in the FDOT work program for walk/bike improvements.

**GROWTH:**
Hillsborough County is projected to add another 1 million new residents by 2045. Robert Woods 2017 report on obesity rates shows that Florida’s rate is 27.4. The rate has been growing, and as the population grows, the trend may continue if not addressed. To accelerate progress in addressing obesity, the Trust for America’s Health (TFAH) and the Robert Wood Johnson Foundation urge policymakers to:

Invest in community-based policies and programs, including nutrition assistance programs such as the Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program (SNAP), and transportation, housing, and community development policies and programs that support physical activity.

Physical activity helps people reduce or maintain their BMI and could help prevent thousands of cases of type 2 diabetes, coronary heart disease and stroke, hypertension, cancer and arthritis, while saving millions of dollars. Our current health outlook has been examined and moving forward, well planned and designed transportation investments can go beyond a primary purpose of moving people to positively influencing the growth of future health of communities for residents, workers, and businesses.
MOVING FORWARD.
Currently, projects in the TIP are prioritized based on the 2040 Long Range Plan performance measures:

Priorities for the TIP were developed by drawing on the extensive prioritization of the County’s transportation needs defined in the Long Range Transportation Plan (known as the Imagine 2040 Plan). Prior to establishing priorities for all new projects, on-going projects - such as road projects where Right-of-Way had been acquired - were moved to the top of the priority list to ensure continuity in the project priorities and implementation. Consistent with FAST Act, projects are selected based on their ability to meet key performance measures identified in the Imagine 2040 Plan. These measures address system preservation, reducing crashes and vulnerability, minimizing traffic for drivers and shippers, providing real choices when not driving, and making investments for economic growth. These investments fund major highway reconstruction, arterial roadway and intersection improvements, maintenance and expansion of the public transit system, bicycle path construction, and improvements for pedestrians.

Active transportation is any self-propelled, human-powered mode of transportation, such as walking or bicycling. The Center for Disease Control reports that physical inactivity is a major contributor to the steady rise in rates of obesity, diabetes, heart disease, stroke, and other chronic health conditions in the United States. Many Americans view walking and bicycling within their communities as unsafe due to heavy traffic and a scarcity of sidewalks, crosswalks, and bicycle facilities. Improving these elements could encourage active transportation such as children biking to school or employees walking to work. Safe and convenient opportunities for physically active travel also expand access to transportation networks for people without cars, while also spurring investment in infrastructure to increase the comfort of the on-road experience to improve the appeal of active modes to all people. (Center for Disease Control, Transportation Health Impact Assessment Toolkit)

Regardless of their abilities, people need the ability to travel, whether for work, school, medical care and other social services, as well as to shop, visit family and friends, and otherwise pursue life’s needs and interests. Many low income or persons with a disability, including retired military, rely on public transit for these needs. The need for improved mobility for these special population groups is particularly apparent in rural and exurban areas where distances are greater, and where fixed-route bus service is limited or unavailable.
Including public health metrics in a transportation planning framework is a way to consider the health co-benefits from transportation projects. Public health performance metrics can become indicators not only of the co-benefits but of the intrinsic benefits of transportation projects. Just as transportation projects are evaluated for congestion relief, the evaluation of projects in terms of the physical activity stimulated can also be evaluated.

With the help of public health professionals, a health lens has been developed for transportation investments similar to other health interventions, to quantify how the investment helps achieve the desired health outcome. Possible considerations include the following:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Performance Measure</th>
<th>Y/N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Does the project help improve recovery time for critical transportation links after a Category 3 storm?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does the project help to reduce severe crashes?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does the project increase the number of street lights installed in high crash corridors?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does the project increase the number of miles of sidewalk present in high pedestrian crash areas/complete network?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does the project include pedestrian intersection improvements (example-high visibility crosswalks, ADA compliant sidewalks, median pedestrian refuge and bulb-outs) 1/4 mile from transit stops?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does the project include pedestrian friendly intersections within Communities of Concern?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does the project reduce the population or households adjacent (500 feet) to congested or high-volume roads (30,000 ADT or a volume to capacity ratio of 1.0 or greater)?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does the project increase the span and/or frequency of transit service?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does the project increase highway centerline miles within 1/2 miles of major healthcare (hospitals), recreation (regional parks, entertainment venues), education (universities and colleges)?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does the project improve transit and/or sidewalk coverage to areas of Essential Destinations (map attached)?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does the project increase the ratio of sidewalk and/or bicycle lanes to roadway miles in the Urban Service Area?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does the project increase transit and/or sidewalk coverage to behavioral health and chronic disease services?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does the project increase the number of miles of sidewalk and trails present within 1/4 mile of populations identified with high rates of behavioral health and chronic disease conditions?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does the project increase sidewalk coverage (both sides of street) within 1/4 mile of transit stops?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Question</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Does the project increase sidewalk coverage (both side of street) for block groups within 1/4 mile of restorative and social activities, e.g. parks, recreation, and community centers?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Does the project increase transit service route miles within 1/4 miles of high proportion of elderly population (over 500 per square mile)?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Does the project increase the percentage of Environmental Justice population living within 1/4 mile of a trail/side path</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Does the project increase transit and/or sidewalk coverage within designated USDA Food Deserts?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Does the project increase the percentage of the Community of Concern population living within 1/4 mile of transit service (map attached)?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TOTAL NUMBER OF PERFORMANCE MEASURES ADDRESSED**

**SUMMARY CONCLUSION:**

There is a rapidly growing awareness of both the positive and negative links between current transportation behavior and public health. Collaboration between transportation and public health officials is pointing towards the significant aggregate and individual benefits that can result from transportation policies that promote active transportation, reduce mobile source pollutant emissions, and improve safety for travelers.

- Local governments are implementing projects that do support good health outcomes.
- Complete Streets projects improve safety, increase access and mobility, maintain air quality standards and promote economic development.
- Every $1 spent on building biking trails and walking paths/sidewalks could save approximately $3 in medical expenses.
- The inclusion of a Health Lens would be an additional factor that would indicate our continued support of the health benefits our transportation system has to all people in Hillsborough County.
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Summary
With the concerning numbers of people hurt and killed on the roadways in Hillsborough County, a multi-pronged approach will be needed. Through Vision Zero, there is an acknowledgement that speed plays a significant role in avoiding and/or surviving crashes.

Reliable data helps point to the most dangerous roadways, the causes of crashes, and the most effective technologies and treatments. The data can also be used to determine the appropriate speed and effective roadway design, that along with automated technology and enforcement, can set the stage for a significant reduction in injuries and fatalities.

A few months ago, while discussing FDOT’s West Busch Boulevard safety improvements, the Transportation Disadvantaged Coordinating Board asked the Policy Committee to explore a more comprehensive, countywide approach to managing speed safely. The attached, proposed approach for an MPO study of speed management has now been reviewed and supported by the Policy Committee, CAC and TAC. All three committees requested that speed management be considered in the context of a comprehensive audit of the contributing factors on high-crash roadways.

Recommended Action
That the MPO initiate a comprehensive safety audit addressing speed management, focusing on the severe-crash corridors in Hillsborough County
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WHY IS THIS IMPORTANT?

SPEED LIMITS
WHAT IS SPEED MANAGEMENT?
DEVELOPING AN ACTION PLAN
Florida - most dangerous state for pedestrians and bicyclists in recent history

Nations Top 10 metro areas with highest pedestrian fatalities

- Cape Coral
- Palm Bay
- Orlando
- Jacksonville
- Daytona Beach
- Lakeland
- Tampa/St. Petersburg
- Sarasota/Bradenton

WHY IS IT IMPORTANT?
On average, one person is dying on Hillsborough streets every day!
Traffic Deaths per 100,000 Residents

US: 10.1  
Florida: 12.5  
Hillsborough: 12.7

What does the data tell us?

For every 1 fatal crash... 8 incapacitating injury crashes occur.
FATAL CRASHES
- 75% occur on roads with posted speeds +40 mph
- 75% of fatal & serious injury crashes occur on one-third of our roads
- 33% of fatal crashes involve aggressive driving
- Pedestrian crashes - one-third result in death or incapacitation

WHAT DOES THE DATA TELL US?

1/3 OF ROADS ACCOUNT FOR 3/4 of severe crashes

TOP 20 CORRIDORS
- 63 miles of roadway
- Comprise 4% of our roads
- 19% severe crashes in five years
- 36% of crashes - Aggressive driving
- 15% of crashes - Ped/Bike crashes
...incremental progress is no longer acceptable given the increasingly rapid advances in technology and the wealth of knowledge about how to prevent crashes...

with the right *policies, technologies, and strategy*, we could *prevent all roadway deaths*”

USDOT, National Safety Council

- Speeding kills more than 10,000/year
- On par with drunk driving
- Doesn’t carry the same social consequences
- 30% of all fatal crashes nationwide
- Societal cost = $40 Billion annually
- *National problem, effective solutions must be applied locally*
SPEED MATTERS MOST

WHY IS THIS IMPORTANT?

SPEED LIMITS

WHAT IS SPEED MANAGEMENT?

DEVELOPING AN ACTION PLAN
SPEED LIMITS

• Speed limit review
• Classify roads by function and activity
• Road rules, legislative, and regulatory settings
• Speed enforcement methods and penalties

Speed limits inform motorists of appropriate safe driving speeds under favorable conditions

Setting speed limits that are safe, consistent, and reasonable is the first step in speed management in order to protect all road users.
TYPES OF SPEED LIMITS

- **STATUTORY**
- **POSTED**
- **SCHOOL ZONE**
- **WORKZONE**
- **VARIABLE**
- **ADVISORY**

**US METHOD OF SETTING SPEED LIMITS**

**Base speed predicated on:**

- 85th percentile speed
  - Based on collective judgement of majority of drivers
  - Posted limits usually set about 5mph lower
  - Method not supported by evidence

- USLIMITS2
  - Considers road, traffic, crash data, access, density, ped/bike activity
  - Median or 50th percentile speed used to set speed limits

- Safe Systems Approach

**What is the 85th percentile speed?**

Speed at which 85 percent of free-flowing traffic is traveling at or below.
2017 National Traffic Safety Board Study

...leads to unintended consequences of higher operating speeds and ...an undesirable cycle of speed escalation and reduced safety!

85th PERCENTILE SPEED SETTING

Seattle
- 40% in crashes
- 30% in injury crashes

NYC
- 14% in crashes
- 49% in pedestrian crashes
- 42% in bicyclist crashes

Mexico City
- 18% in crashes

SPEED LIMIT REDUCTION RESULTS

Seattle
- 40% in crashes
- 30% in injury crashes

NYC
- 14% in crashes
- 49% in pedestrian crashes
- 42% in bicyclist crashes

Mexico City
- 18% in crashes
### TARGET SPEED

**C1-Natural**
- Lands preserved in a natural or wilderness condition, including lands unsuitable for settlement due to natural conditions.

**C2-Rural**
- Sparsely settled lands, may include agricultural land, prairies, woodland, and wetlands.

**C2T-Rural Town**
- Small concentrations of developed areas immediately surrounded by rural and natural areas, includes many historic towns.

**C3R-Suburban Residential**
- Mostly residential area with large blocks and a disconnected or sparse roadway network.

**C3C-Suburban Commercial**
- Mostly non-residential uses with large building footprints and large parking lots within large blocks, and a disconnected or sparse roadway network.

**C4-Urban General**
- Mix of uses set within small blocks with a well-connected roadway network, may extend long distances. The roadway network usually connects to residential neighborhoods immediately along the corridor or behind the areas forming the roadway.

**C5-Urban Center**
- Mix of uses set within small blocks with a well-connected roadway network. Typically concentrated around a few blocks and located as part of a civic or commercial center of a community, town, or city.

**C6-Urban Core**
- Areas with the highest densities and building heights, and within a 100-year floodplain or within ESOT classified Large Urbanized Areas (population >1,000,000). Many are regional centers and destinations. Buildings have mixed uses, are built up to the roadway, and are within a well-connected roadway network.

### WHY IS THIS IMPORTANT?

1. **SPEED LIMITS**
2. **WHAT IS SPEED MANAGEMENT?**
3. **DEVELOPING AN ACTION PLAN**
WHAT IS SPEED MANAGEMENT?

Speed management is not just about reducing speed, but to a considerable extent about planning and designing the road and network in a way that an appropriate speed is obtained.

GOAL
• Improve public health and safety by reducing speeding-related fatalities and injuries.

DESIRED OUTCOMES
• Reduction in speeding-related fatalities and injuries
• Improved safety experience for all road users - motorists, pedestrians, and bicyclists.
WHAT IS SPEED MANAGEMENT?

SPEED MANAGEMENT ATTRIBUTES:

- Data-driven - crash, roadway, user, landuse data
- Applying road design, traffic operations, & safety measures
- Setting “appropriate/rational/desirable/safe” speed limits
- Institutionalize good practices
- Supportive enforcement efforts
- Effective outreach & public engagement
- Cooperation by traffic safety stakeholders

Design - Speed Management Countermeasures

- Road Diet
- Speed Humps / Tables
- Roundabouts
- Raised / Refuge islands
- On-Street Parking
- Street Trees
- Narrow Lane widths
- Horizontal/Vertical Curvature
- Short Blocks/ Midblock Crossings
- Pavement markings and Signs

Source: USDOT, SPEED MANAGEMENT PROGRAM PLAN, MAY 2014
APPROPRIATE SPEED SETTING

WHAT IS SPEED MANAGEMENT?

Intelligent Transportation Systems to Manage Speed

- Driver feedback signs
- Install signals to maintain an orderly progression
- Time signals for target speed
- Rest in Red signals
- Excessive speeds trigger red signal indication
**SUPPORTIVE ENFORCEMENT TECHNIQUES**

- Automated Speed Enforcement
- Automated Red Light Cameras
- Targeted enforcement on high crash corridors
- Higher fines on high crash corridors
- Radar and Laser Speed Monitoring
- Aerial enforcement

**WHAT IS SPEED MANAGEMENT?**

- Reduction in fatal crashes
- Reduction in crash severity
- Reduction in societal costs
  - Emergency services
  - Lost time at work
  - Medical costs
  - Property damage costs
  - Insurance costs
- Eases congestion related to crash delays
- Encourages non-motorized transportation
- Resulting in safer and healthier communities
WHY IS THIS IMPORTANT?

SPEED LIMITS

WHAT IS SPEED MANAGEMENT?

DEVELOPING AN ACTION PLAN

SPEED MANAGEMENT ACTION PLAN

- Partners and Stakeholders
- Existing Speed Management Practices
- Industry Best Practices
- Establish Speed Management Practices
- Measuring Success
- Pilot Project
Partners & Stakeholders

- Hillsborough County MPO
- Hillsborough County
- City of Tampa
- Law Enforcement
- FDOT
- FHWA
- Department of Health
- Advocacy Organizations
- Other

Existing Speed Management Practices

- Industry Best Practices
  - Statewide Best Practices
  - National Best Practices
Establish Enhanced Speed Management Practices

- In Conjunction with the Steering Committee
- Select Existing Speed Management Practices to Retain
- Select Statewide and National Best Practices to Adopt
- Generate Enhance Speed Management Practices

Establish Goals:
- Reduce Crash Fatalities
- Reduce Crash Severity
- Reduce Pedestrians/Bicyclist Crashes
- Reduce Average Operating Speed

Performance Measures:
- Establish Key Performance Indices
- Establish Data Requirements
- Establish Dashboards on Status
PILOT PROJECT

- Select corridors
- Different types of roadways/function/context
- Different jurisdictions (City & County)
- Evaluate corridor needs - Baseline
- Identify and Install treatments & strategies
- Evaluate effects
- Identify lessons learned
- Finalize the action plan

WHAT ARE WE ASKING FOR?

- Commitment to preventing fatalities & serious injuries!

- Develop a Hillsborough County Speed Management Action Plan

SAFETY FIRST
SO YOU LAST
THANK YOU!

Presented by
Paula Flores, FITE
Michael Salatti, P.E., PTOE
of Greenman-Pedersen, Inc.

GPI
Board & Committee Agenda Item

**Agenda Item**
FDOT Tentative Work Program & MPO Comments

**Presenter**
FDOT Representative

**Summary**
In preparation for the development of the Fiscal Year (FY) 2020 – 2024 Transportation Improvement Program (TIP), the MPO has the opportunity to comment on FDOT’s Tentative Work Program, which shows projects and phases programmed for funding during the next 5 years. MPO staff and committees have proposed no comments.

Staff from the Florida Department of Transportation (FDOT) will present the Work Program highlights, including the MPO priority projects that have now been funded. Only the projects with new or different funding will be presented, not every project in the 5 years.

Some project funding highlights include:

- I-75 at Big Bend Interchange improvements
- Vision Zero Corridor Studies for Hillsborough County
- Ola Ave and Central Ave Bikeways
- El Prado Complete Street Improvements
- Urban Corridor Improvement along Nebraska, Florida, Highland, Tampa
- SR 60 Intersection Improvements
- Apollo Beach Road Extension

**Recommended Action**
Support the FDOT Tentative Work Program and provide comments if needed

**Prepared By**
Sarah McKinley, MPO Staff

**Attachments**
FDOT Tentative Work Program Highlights FY 2020 - 2024
Board & Committee Agenda Item

**Agenda Item**
MPO Representation in White v. Hillsborough County et.al.

**Presenter**
Cameron Clark, MPO Attorney, and Rob Brazel, Hillsborough County Attorney’s Office

**Summary**
The MPO has been served with a complaint filed by Commissioner White (attached). The MPO currently has an agreement with the Hillsborough County Attorney’s Office to provide counsel. Depending on the MPO’s response to the complaint, the County Attorney’s office may or may not be able to provide representation in this matter.

Some options for the MPO to respond to the complaint might include: move to be dismissed from the case; take no position and abide by the will of the court; contest the complaint, and obtain legal counsel either through a procurement process or by agreeing to be represented by Hillsborough County’s outside counsel. The last option might be a cost-effective and timely way to participate in the case, should the MPO Board care to do so; it is contingent on the MPO Board having the same position regarding the complaint as Hillsborough County.

The County Attorney’s Office will provide more and better information about the options at the meeting.

**Recommended Action**
Based on board member discussion

**Prepared By**
Beth Alden, MPO Director

**Attachments**
Complaint for Declaratory Judgment
IN THE CIRCUIT COURT OF THE THIRTEENTH JUDICIAL CIRCUIT
IN AND FOR HILLSBOROUGH COUNTY, FLORIDA

STACY WHITE, in his official capacity
as a county commissioner of
Hillsborough County, Florida

Plaintiff,

v.                                                 Case No.:

HILLSBOROUGH COUNTY, a charter county
of the State of Florida; The HILLSBOROUGH
AREA REGIONAL TRANSIT AUTHORITY;
The CITY OF TAMPA; The CITY OF TEMPLE
TERRACE; PLANT CITY; The HILLSBOROUGH
METROPOLITAN PLANNING ORGANIZATION;
PAT C. FRANK, in her official capacity as the Clerk
of the Circuit Court of Hillsborough County, Florida;
BOB HENRIQUEZ, in his official capacity as the
Hillsborough County Property Appraiser; DOUG
BELDEN, in his official capacity as the Hillsborough
County Tax Collector; and The FLORIDA
DEPARTMENT OF REVENUE,

Defendants.

/_____________________________________

COMPLAINT FOR DECLARATORY JUDGMENT

The Plaintiff, Stacy White (Commissioner White), in his official capacity as a county commissioner of Hillsborough County, by and through his undersigned attorneys, brings this action for declaratory judgment. In light of the recent passage of Article 11 of the Hillsborough County Charter, which creates and implements a local transportation surtax, Commissioner White is in doubt about his duties and obligations as a county commissioner because his duties and obligations under section 212.055(1), Florida Statutes (2018), which is that statute allowing a county to create such a surtax, appear to conflict with his duties and obligations as stated in Article 11. Commissioner White is therefore in doubt about the validity of Article 11. The Defendants
are named as parties because they have also been given duties, rights or obligations under Article 11.

**INTRODUCTION**

Section 212.055(1), Florida Statutes (2018), is the statute that authorizes a charter county to implement a 1% sales surtax to fund transportation projects. A county cannot create such a transportation surtax unless it is authorized by and is consistent with the requirements of section 212.055(1). An accurate copy of the opening paragraph of section 212.055 and section 212.055(1) is attached to this complaint as Exhibit A.

Article 11 of the Hillsborough County Charter, the “Surtax for Transportation Improvements,” was recently submitted to the Hillsborough County voters by initiative petition and was approved by a majority of those voters. A true and accurate copy of Article 11 is attached to this complaint as Exhibit B.

Article 11 acknowledges that the local tax must be consistent with section 212.055(1). In section 11.02, it states, in part:

> Any other provisions of this Chapter to the contrary notwithstanding, **all proceeds from the Transportation Surtax**, including any interest earnings and bond proceeds generated therefrom, **shall be expended only as permitted by** this Article 11, F.S. § 212.055(1), and in accordance with the purpose set forth in Section 11.01 above. (emphasis supplied).

Commissioner White is concerned because, despite the above-quoted acknowledgement, Article 11 appears to conflict with section 212.055(1) in many substantial ways. The total proceeds of this surtax are likely to exceed $9 billion. If Commissioner White acts, as a member of the Board of County Commissioners to implement this surtax, and Article 11 is later invalidated after taxes have been collected, the County will not have better roads; it will have a mess to clean up. The risk of a judicial determination that Article 11 is invalid after taxes have been collected is high
because any use of the proceeds that requires a bond validation proceeding under Chapter 75, Florida Statutes, should be dependent upon the validity of Article 11. Accordingly, he has concluded that he must obtain a legally binding determination of his duties and responsibilities at the inception of this planned tax in order to fulfill his oath of office.

The conflict between section 212.055(1) and Article 11 of the Charter is explained in detail in this complaint, but the central concerns are three-fold:

- Section 212.055(1) provides that the Board of County Commissions (BOCC) "shall" have the authority to allocate these proceeds. But for the entire 30-year period of taxation, Article 11 predetermines how the proceeds of this surtax must be distributed.

- Article 11 creates an "Independent Oversight Commission" (IOC) that is an unelected, unbonded, and unpaid committee of private citizens who are given substantial powers over this huge fund of surtax proceeds. The IOC is effectively given veto powers over decisions made by and projects approved by the BOCC. But Article VII, §1(e) of the Florida Constitution provides that the BOCC is the "governing body" of Hillsborough County. Commissioner White recognizes that constitutionally created Florida Courts have power to review and sometimes override decisions of the BOCC, but he is unaware of any Florida law that allows for an unelected committee to review and override the decisions of any Florida constitutional officer—including the members of the BOCC. Section 212.055(1) provides for no such committee and expressly gives the elected, bonded members of the BOCC the duty and responsibility to apply proceeds to uses that the BOCC deems appropriate.

- Article 11 places a substantial restriction on the BOCC that prevents it over the next 30 years from using a large percentage of the surtax proceeds for projects that add additional lanes to existing roads or that build new roads or streets – even if the members of the BOCC unanimously
agree that conditions at the time would warrant such expenditures. This restriction conflicts with section 212.055(1).

The ballot summary for Article 11 did not disclose these and other serious issues to the voters. As explained in this complaint, the ballot summary was legally insufficient.

Thus, Commissioner White, in order to fulfill his duties and responsibilities as a county commissioner, seeks a declaratory judgment that:

1. the restrictions in Article 11 on his statutory duties and responsibilities, as well as those of the other members of the BOCC, are in violation of Florida general law;

2. that the powers given to the IOC in Article 11 are not authorized by Florida general law and conflict with the statutory and constitutional duties of the BOCC, and

3. that the defects in both Article 11 and in the ballot summary presented to the voters at the election are such that the law of Florida requires this Court to declare Article 11 unlawful, invalid, and unenforceable.

JURISDICTION AND VENUE

1. This is an action for a declaratory judgment pursuant to section 86.011, Florida Statutes (2018). This Court has jurisdiction of the subject matter of this complaint.

2. Venue is proper in Hillsborough County to determine the duties and obligations of a member of the BOCC under the County Charter and the Laws of the State of Florida.

PARTIES

3. Commissioner White is a member of the Hillsborough County BOCC. He was first elected to that position in 2014, reelected in 2018, and his current term extends until 2022.

4. Defendant, Hillsborough County, is a charter county of the State of Florida, organized pursuant to Article VIII of the Constitution of the State of Florida. The charter under which it operates was recently amended to include Article 11.
5. The Hillsborough Area Regional Transit Authority (HART) is a transportation authority chartered pursuant to Chapter 163, Florida Statutes. In Article 11, HART is described as an “Agency” and is entitled to receive 45% of the surtax proceeds each year without the BOCC voting annually—or ever—to remit this amount.

6. The City of Tampa is a municipality located in Hillsborough County. In Article 11, Tampa is described as an “Agency,” and it is entitled to a distribution of a portion of the tax proceeds each year under a “distribution formula.” It is automatically entitled to this distribution without the BOCC ever voting to distribute any amount to it. It is entitled to this amount even in the absence of an interlocal agreement under Chapter 163.

7. The City of Temple Terrace is a municipality in Hillsborough County. In Article 11, the City of Temple Terrace is described as an “Agency” and it is entitled to a distribution of a portion of the tax proceeds each year under a “distribution formula.” It is automatically entitled to this distribution without the BOCC ever voting to distribute any amount to it. It is entitled to this amount even in the absence of an interlocal agreement under Chapter 163.

8. Plant City is a municipality in Hillsborough County. In Article 11, Plant City is described as an “Agency,” and it is entitled to a distribution of a portion of the tax proceeds each year under a “distribution formula.” It is automatically entitled to this distribution without the BOCC ever voting to distribute any amount to it. It is entitled to this amount even in the absence of an interlocal agreement under Chapter 163.

9. The Hillsborough Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO) is a transportation policy-making board created pursuant to section 339.175, Florida Statutes. In Article 11, MPO is not described as an “Agency,” but it is nevertheless entitled to receive 1% of the surtax proceeds each year without the BOCC ever voting to distribute this amount.
10. Pat C. Frank is the Clerk of the Circuit Court of Hillsborough County. The Clerk is named in her official capacity. The Clerk is responsible for receiving the proceeds of the surtax challenged in this Complaint from the Florida Department of Revenue and distributing those proceeds. Under the terms of Article 11, the Clerk is required to distribute funds to HART, and the several municipalities in predetermined proportions without any authorization from the BOCC. The Clerk apparently is required to obey the IOC if it orders a suspension of distributions to Agencies or overrides the BOCC. The Clerk is also required to select an attorney as a member of the IOC.

11. Bob Henriquez is the Property Appraiser of Hillsborough County. The Property Appraiser is named in his official capacity. The Property Appraiser is required to select a member of the IOC.

12. Doug Belden is the Tax Collector of Hillsborough County. The Tax Collector is named in his official capacity. The Tax Collector is required to select a member of the IOC.

13. The Florida Department of Revenue collects the proceeds of the surtax challenged in this Complaint and distributes those proceeds to the Clerk.

**THE CREATION OF ARTICLE 11**

14. Article 11 was not drafted and approved by attorneys representing Hillsborough County or the State of Florida. Its content was neither debated nor voted upon by the BOCC. Although pursuant to section 212.055(10), Florida Statutes, a “performance audit” for Article 11 was completed on September 5, 2018, it did not address the issues presented in this complaint. Article 11 has never been determined to satisfy the Laws and the Constitution of the State of Florida by any Court.
15. Article 11 was drafted by private citizens. This amendment to Hillsborough County’s Charter was accomplished by “initiative” under Section 8.03 of the Charter. A true and accurate copy of Article 11, as presented on the “County Charter Amendment Petition Form” is attached hereto and incorporated herein as Exhibit B.

16. On November 6, 2018, the voters of Hillsborough County considered the adoption of this amendment. The ballot used the ballot title and ballot summary language provided in Exhibit B.

17. The ballot also contained a “financial impact statement” immediately following the ballot summary. The financial impact statement was required by section 8.03(3) of the Charter and section 101.161(1), Florida Statutes. An accurate copy of the entire information provided on the Official General Election Ballot for Hillsborough County for the November 6, 2018, election concerning Article 11, including both the ballot summary and the financial impact statement, is attached hereto as Exhibit C.

18. The Hillsborough County Canvassing Board’s Official Results establish that this amendment was approved by 282,753 “yes” votes to 210,722 “no” votes. An accurate copy of the Official Results is attached hereto as Exhibit D.

COUNT 1

The Provisions of Article 11 Prevent The BOCC from Discharging its Statutory Duties and Responsibilities to Apply the Proceeds of the Surtax As the BOCC “Deems Appropriate.”

19. Commissioner White repeats paragraphs 1 through 18 as if fully set forth herein.

20. Section 212.054(1), Florida Statutes, provides that: “[n]o general excise tax on sales shall be levied by the governing body of any county unless specifically authorized in s. 212.055.”
21. The opening paragraph of section 212.055 and section 212.055(1) provides the authorization and requirements for a discretionary sales surtax to fund transportation spending.

22. Section 212.055(1)(d) specifies that “[p]roceeds from the surtax shall be applied to as many or as few of the uses enumerated below in whatever combination the county commission deems appropriate[.]”

23. Article 11 prevents the BOCC from applying the proceeds of the surtax to as many or as few of the uses, and in whatever combination, the BOCC deems appropriate:
   a. For a period of 30 years, section 11.05(2) mandates that 45% of the proceeds of the surtax, an amount that in total will likely exceed $4 billion, must be distributed annually to HART without any vote of the BOCC;
   b. For a period of 30 years, section 11.05(1) mandates that 54% of the proceeds of the surtax must be distributed to Hillsborough County and the above-referenced municipalities based on a “distribution formula” and without any vote of the BOCC.
   c. For a period of 30 years, section 11.05(3) mandates that 1% of the proceeds of the surtax, an amount that in total will likely exceed $90 million, must be distributed annually to the MPO without any vote of the BOCC.
   d. For a period of 30 years, section 11.07(8) restricts the BOCC’s statutory right to use a substantial percentage of the proceeds of the surtax to add additional lanes for automobile traffic to existing roads and to build new roads and streets.

24. In authorizing a local transportation surtax, the Legislature specified that the duly elected members of the BOCC, as the constitutional “governing body” of Hillsborough County must have the duty and the responsibility, when the BOCC deems it appropriate, to “remit” surtax proceeds to HART as a transportation authority. By creating a compulsory distribution of 45% of
the proceeds, Article 11 prevents the BOCC from exercising its judgment to fulfill its statutory duties and responsibilities established by the Legislature in the express text of section 212.055(1).

25. By creating compulsory distributions in set amounts to the municipalities and the MPO, Article 11 prevents the BOCC from exercising its judgment to fulfill its statutory duties and responsibilities established by the Legislature in section 212.055(1).

26. In authorizing a local transportation surtax, the Legislature specified that the duly elected members of the BOCC were entitled to apply the proceeds of the surtax to as many of the enumerated uses and in whatever combination the BOCC deemed appropriate. One of the enumerated uses in that statute is the use “by the county for the development, construction, operation, and maintenance of roads and bridges in the county.” In creating a categorical prohibition on the use of substantial portions of the surtax to build additional lanes for automobile traffic and to build new roads and streets, Article 11 prevents the BOCC from exercising its judgment to fulfill its statutory duties and responsibilities established by the Legislature in the express text of section 212.055(1).

27. Section 11.07(6) of Article 11 permits inter-Agency distributions of certain proceeds, not including the proceeds distributed to HART. But the authority to make such an adjustment is given to the Agency. Thus, the BOCC is prevented from using its judgment to make these reallocations of the proceeds. It is merely given the authority to reduce the distribution to the County for the benefit one of the municipalities.

28. Section 11.07(9) of Article 11 permits reallocation of expenditure categories under section 11.07. But that power is vested only in the IOC, not in the BOCC.
Requested Relief

WHEREFORE, Commissioner White respectfully requests this Court enter a declaratory judgment:

a. Declaring that Article 11 of the Charter conflicts with section 212.055(1) and that the mandatory distribution of surtax proceeds created in section 11.05 of the Charter is invalid and unenforceable;

b. Declaring that Article 11 of the Charter conflicts with section 212.055(1) and that the prohibition on the use of proceeds for additional traffic lanes for automobile traffic and the prohibition on the use of proceeds for the creation of new roads and streets in section 11.07(8) of the Charter is invalid and unenforceable;

c. Declaring that Article 11 of the Charter conflicts with section 212.055(1) and that the provisions in sections 11.07(6) and 11.07(9) giving redistribution powers to the IOC and the municipalities are invalid and unenforceable;

d. Declaring that any transportation surtax in Hillsborough County must provide the BOCC with the duties and responsibilities specified in section 212.055(1)(d) and that Article 11 does not so provide;

e. Declaring that the invalid portions of Article 11 described in the preceding subparagraphs are so central to Article 11—both as presented to the voters and as it is to be implemented for the next 30 years—that they cannot be severed from Article 11 under the narrow severability clause in section 11.11(2) of Article 11, and that Article 11 in its entirety is invalid and unenforceable, and

f. Declaring that Commissioner White has no lawful requirement, as a member of the BOCC, to deliberate or vote on measures to implement Article 11.
COUNT II

The Provisions of Article 11 Prevent the BOCC from Discharging its Statutory Duties and Responsibilities to Remit and Distribute Proceeds of the Surtax To HART and Other “Agencies” In Amounts It Determines To Be Appropriate

29. Commissioner White repeats paragraphs 1 through 18 as if fully set forth herein.

30. Section 11.04 of Article 11 requires the Clerk to receive the proceeds of the surtax from the Florida Department of Revenue and to distribute those proceeds to the “Agencies” within five business days of receipt.

31. The Clerk is required to distribute the proceeds in accordance with section 11.05, which contains the compulsory distributions discussed in Count I.

32. Under Article 11, the Clerk’s duty to disperse the proceeds is automatic and not dependent on any authorizing vote of the BOCC at any time, much less annually.

33. Section 221.055(1)(d)(2) specifies that a transportation authority may receive funds if “remitted by the governing body of the county” when the BOCC is making its decisions as to what enumerated uses it “deems appropriate.”

34. The Legislature restricted the decision to remit proceeds of the surtax to the duly elected members of the BOCC, as the constitutional “governing body” in Hillsborough County accountable to all local residents. Article 11 violates and conflicts with section 212.055(1).

Requested Relief

WHEREFORE, Commissioner White respectfully requests this Court enter a declaratory judgment:

a. Declaring that Article 11 of the Charter conflicts with section 212.055(1) and that the distribution duties created for the Clerk in section 11.04, in the absence of any prior vote to distribute by Commissioner White and the other members of the BOCC, is invalid and unenforceable;
b. Declaring that the invalid portions of Article 11 described in the preceding subparagraph, independently and also coupled with those described in Count I are so central to Article 11—both as presented to the voters and as it is to be implemented for the next 30 years—that they cannot be severed from Article 11 under the narrow severability clause in section 11.11(2) of Article 11, and that Article 11 in its entirety is invalid and unenforceable, and

c. Declaring that Commissioner White has no lawful requirement, as a member of the BOCC, to deliberate or vote on measures to implement Article 11.

COUNT III

The Creation and Powers of the IOC Are Not Authorized by Any General Law and Are in Conflict With Section 212.055(1)

35. Commissioner White repeats paragraphs 1 through 18 as if fully set forth herein.

36. Section 212.055(1) makes no reference to an “Independent Oversight Committee.” It provides no powers or authority to any such committee. It does not authorize a County to create such a committee or to delegate the BOCC’s constitutional and statutory decision-making authority to such a committee. It gives no power of judicial or quasi-judicial review to any such committee, no matter the credentials of its unelected members.

37. Section 11.10 of Article 11 requires the creation of an “Independent Oversight Committee,” which shall provide oversight “of the distribution and expenditure” of the proceeds of the surtax.

a. Each municipality is required to appoint at least one member of the IOC;

b. The Property Appraiser, the Tax Collector and the County Clerk are each required to appoint one member;

c. The Board of Directors of HART are required to appoint two members; and
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d. The BOCC is required to appoint four members.

38. Section 11.10 requires the BOCC to appropriate County funds annually to pay for the administrative expenses of the IOC. These funds do not appear to come from the proceeds of the surtax because the surtax proceeds are mandated to be completely (100%) distributed by the provisions of section 11.05.

39. The IOC is expressly given certain “powers and duties,” including the power to “approve Project Plans and approve and certify as to whether the projects therein comply with [Article 11].”

40. Section 11.06 of Article 11 discusses “Agency Project Plans.” During the annual planning process, each project plan “must be approved by the governing body of the applicable Agency and by a majority vote of the Independent Oversight Committee.”

41. While section 212.055(1) vests the BOCC with the exclusive authority to use its judgment to make the decisions it deems appropriate for the annual use of the proceeds from the surtax, Article 11 removes the BOCC entirely from the approval process for the percentages—exceeding 50% of the proceeds—that are automatically distributed to HART and the municipalities.

42. While section 212.055(1) vests authority in the BOCC to make the decisions it deems appropriate for the annual use of the proceeds from the surtax, Section 11.06 requires that each project plan approved by the BOCC must also be approved by a majority vote of the IOC. Thus, the IOC can effectively veto a project that has been approved by the BOCC. The IOC can do so despite the fact that: (1) its existence is not authorized by the constitution or any statute, (2) a majority of its members are not selected by the BOCC, (3) its members are not elected or
otherwise accountable to the local residents, and (4) Article 11 creates no standards for the IOC to apply or obey in deciding to veto a project approved by the BOCC.

43. Sections 11.10(1) and 11.09 empowers the IOC, by a two-thirds vote, to determine that "an Agency has failed to comply with any term or condition of Article 11." If the Agency fails to correct the non-compliance, the IOC has the power to direct the Clerk to suspend distributions of proceeds to the Agency. Thus, the IOC is given the power to make findings of fact about the compliance of the Agencies with Article 11 and to enjoin constitutional officers from performing duties established by general law. These are powers of judicial review given by a county ordinance to a board of unelected private citizens in the absence of any provision in the Florida Constitution or Florida general law authorizing such power.

44. The provisions in Article 11 creating the IOC, funding the IOC, providing for the selection of its members, and extending extensive powers to the IOC are all without any authorization in section 212.055(1) and are in conflict with the authority granted to the BOCC by the Florida Constitution and by the Legislature in a duly enacted general law.

Requested Relief

WHEREFORE, Commissioner White respectfully requests this Court enter a declaratory judgment:

a. Declaring that section 11.10 of Article 11 of the Charter, by creating the IOC and authorizing it to perform duties of the BOCC, conflicts with section 212.055(1) and is invalid and unenforceable;

b. Declaring that section 11.09 of Article 11 of the Charter, by vesting unauthorized judicial power in the IOC, conflicts with general law including section 212.055(1) and is invalid and unenforceable;
c. Declaring that section 11.06 of Article 11 of the Charter, in requiring the BOCC to obtain the approval of the IOC before the BOCC can deem a project to be an acceptable use of the surtax proceeds and apply those proceeds to the project as a valid use, conflicts with section 212.055(1) and is invalid and unenforceable;

d. Declaring that the invalid portions of Article 11 described in the preceding subparagraph, independently and also coupled with those described in Counts I and II, are so central to Article 11 – both as presented to the voters and as it is to be implemented for the next 30 years – that they cannot be severed from Article 11 under the narrow severability clause in section 11.11(2) of Article 11, and that Article 11 in its entirety is invalid and unenforceable; and

e. Declaring that Commissioner White has no lawful requirement, as a member of the BOCC to deliberate or vote on measures to appoint members to the IOC or to provide County funds for the budget of the IOC.

COUNT IV

The Ballot Summary was Legally Insufficient and Did Not Provide the Voters with Fair Notice of the Contents of the Proposed Initiative

45. Commissioner White repeats paragraphs 1 through 18 as if fully set forth herein.

46. The ballot summary states:

Should transportation improvements be funded throughout Hillsborough County, including Tampa, Plant City, Temple Terrace, Brandon, Town ‘n’ Country, and Sun City, including projects that:

- Improve roads and bridges,
- Expand public transit options,
- Fix potholes,
- Enhance bus services,
- Relieve rush hour bottlenecks,
- Improve intersections, and
- Make walking and biking safer,
By amending the County Charter to enact a one-cent sales surtax levied for 30 years and deposited in an audited trust fund with independent oversight?

47. Additional language was added to the summary to explain its financial impact.

That language states:

A new 1% sales surtax is in addition to the current 7% sales tax and is estimated to raise $276 million annually and $552 million the first two calendar years. Revenues will be shared by Hillsborough Area Regional Transit Authority (HART); Metropolitan Planning Organization; and, using a population-based formula, by Hillsborough County Board of County Commissioners, City of Tampa, Plant City, and City of Temple Terrace. Expenditures will be governed by the Charter Amendment.

48. Although the sufficiency of the ballot summary should be tested alone, even considering both the ballot summary and the financial impact information together, this summary is misleading in at least four respects:

a. The summary does not tell voters that HART will always receive 45% of the proceeds of the surtax even if the BOCC thinks that percentage is too high or too low in any given year.

b. It expressly lists Brandon, Town ‘n’ County, and Sun City along with Tampa, Plant City and Temple Terrace, even though these communities are not municipalities, are not given a member on the IOC, and have no special part in the distribution formula. The residents of these communities have no rights that are any different from the voters in any other precinct of unincorporated Hillsborough County, such as precincts in Wimauma, Progress Village, or Lutz. But the voters were led to believe that they had special rights.

c. It lists many projects that might be funded with the surtax, but fails to mention the extreme 30-year limitation in section 11.07(8) preventing general purpose funds
from being used to add additional lanes for automobile traffic or to build new roads.

Additional lanes and new roads are the types of projects that voters undoubtedly expected the new taxes to fund given that the first use of proceeds suggested by the summary is to "improve roads and bridges." These are projects that the BOCC has authority to fund under section 212.055(1), but Article 11 prevents the BOCC from exercising its discretion to fund these projects even if safety is the primary concern.

d. The creation and powers of the IOC are explained to the voters only with the ambiguous phrase "an audited trust fund with independent oversight." The IOC has oversight over far more than the "audited trust fund." The voters are not told that this committee can effectively veto projects approved by the county commission and the several city councils. Its extensive powers and the sizable budget required to staff and perform those powers are not mentioned.

49. Admittedly, the 75-word limitation applicable to the summary requires succinct wording, but the words selected confuse rather than inform the voter. Under the standards required for an adequate ballot summary for an initiative petition, the information provided to the voters was legally insufficient.

50. The ballot summary could have stated, for example:

Should the County Charter be amended to enact a one-cent sales tax, levied for 30 years and placed in an audited trust account, to fund transportation improvements in Hillsborough County, Tampa, Plant City, and Temple Terrace, that are approved by an unelected, independent oversight committee – with 45% of the proceeds restricted for HART transit projects, 1% for planning, and 54% for general transportation projects, with limitations on projects adding lanes or creating new roads?

Perhaps the financial impact statement could have explained:
The budget for the independent oversight committee's staff will be included in the County's budget.

51. The ballot language in this case is defective for what it does say and for what it does not say. The fact that a majority of the voters approved the amendment when presented with this defective ballot language does not cure the error created by the language.

**Requested Relief**

WHEREFORE, Commissioner White respectfully requests this Court enter a declaratory judgment:

a. Declaring that the ballot language for Article 11 was legally insufficient and that, accordingly, Article 11 was not validly approved by the voters and is null and void.

b. Declaring that Commissioner White has no lawful requirement, as a member of the BOCC to deliberate or vote on measures to implement Article 11.

Dated: December 4, 2018

Respectfully submitted,

/s/ Chris W. Altenbernd

Chris W. Altenbernd, Esq.
Florida Bar No: 197394

**BANKER LOPEZ GASSLER P.A.**
501 East Kennedy Blvd., Suite 1700
Tampa, FL 33602
Telephone: (813) 221-1500
Fax No: (813) 222-3066
Email: caltenbernd@bankerlopez.com
Service Email: service-caltenbernd@bankerlopez.com
The 2018 Florida Statutes

212.055 Discretionary sales surtaxes; legislative intent; authorization and use of proceeds.—It is the legislative intent that any authorization for imposition of a discretionary sales surtax shall be published in the Florida Statutes as a subsection of this section, irrespective of the duration of the levy. Each enactment shall specify the types of counties authorized to levy; the rate or rates which may be imposed; the maximum length of time the surtax may be imposed, if any; the procedure which must be followed to secure voter approval, if required; the purpose for which the proceeds may be expended; and such other requirements as the Legislature may provide. Taxable transactions and administrative procedures shall be as provided in s. 212.054.

(1) CHARTER COUNTY AND REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION SYSTEM SURTAX.—

(a) Each charter county that has adopted a charter, each county the government of which is consolidated with that of one or more municipalities, and each county that is within or under an interlocal agreement with a regional transportation or transit authority created under chapter 343 or chapter 349 may levy a discretionary sales surtax, subject to approval by a majority vote of the electorate of the county or by a charter amendment approved by a majority vote of the electorate of the county.

(b) The rate shall be up to 1 percent.

(c) The proposal to adopt a discretionary sales surtax as provided in this subsection and to create a trust fund within the county accounts shall be placed on the ballot in accordance with law at a time to be set at the discretion of the governing body.

(d) Proceeds from the surtax shall be applied to as many or as few of the uses enumerated below in whatever combination the county commission deems appropriate:

1. Deposited by the county in the trust fund and shall be used for the purposes of development, construction, equipment, maintenance, operation, supportive services, including a countywide bus system, on-demand transportation services, and related costs of a fixed guideway rapid transit system;

2. Remitted by the governing body of the county to an expressway, transit, or transportation authority created by law to be used, at the discretion of such authority, for the development, construction, operation, or maintenance of roads or bridges in the county, for the operation and maintenance of a bus system, for the operation and maintenance of on-demand transportation services, for the payment of principal and interest on existing bonds issued for the construction of such roads or bridges, and, upon approval by the county commission, such proceeds may be pledged for bonds issued to refinance existing bonds or new bonds issued for the construction of such roads or bridges;

3. Used by the county for the development, construction, operation, and maintenance of roads and bridges in the county; for the expansion, operation, and maintenance of bus and fixed guideway
systems; for the expansion, operation, and maintenance of on-demand transportation services; and for the payment of principal and interest on bonds issued for the construction of fixed guideway rapid transit systems, bus systems, roads, or bridges; and such proceeds may be pledged by the governing body of the county for bonds issued to refinance existing bonds or new bonds issued for the construction of such fixed guideway rapid transit systems, bus systems, roads, or bridges and no more than 25 percent used for nontransit uses; and

4. Used by the county for the planning, development, construction, operation, and maintenance of roads and bridges in the county; for the planning, development, expansion, operation, and maintenance of bus and fixed guideway systems; for the planning, development, construction, operation, and maintenance of on-demand transportation services; and for the payment of principal and interest on bonds issued for the construction of fixed guideway rapid transit systems, bus systems, roads, or bridges; and such proceeds may be pledged by the governing body of the county for bonds issued to refinance existing bonds or new bonds issued for the construction of such fixed guideway rapid transit systems, bus systems, roads, or bridges. Pursuant to an interlocal agreement entered into pursuant to chapter 163, the governing body of the county may distribute proceeds from the tax to a municipality, or an expressway or transportation authority created by law to be expended for the purpose authorized by this paragraph. Any county that has entered into interlocal agreements for distribution of proceeds to one or more municipalities in the county shall revise such interlocal agreements no less than every 5 years in order to include any municipalities that have been created since the prior interlocal agreements were executed.

(e) As used in this subsection, the term “on-demand transportation services” means transportation provided between flexible points of origin and destination selected by individual users with such service being provided at a time that is agreed upon by the user and the provider of the service and that is not fixed-schedule or fixed-route in nature.
COUNTY CHARTER AMENDMENT PETITION FORM

Note:
- All information on this form, including your signature, becomes a public record upon receipt by the Supervisor of Elections.
- Under Florida law, it is a first degree misdemeanor, punishable as provided in s. 775.082 or s. 775.08, Florida Statutes, to knowingly sign more than one petition for an issue. [Section 104.185, Florida Statutes]
- If all requested information on this form is not completed, the form will not be valid.

Your Name

Please Print Name as it appears on your Voter Information Card

Your Address

City __________________ Zip __________ County __________________

☐ Please change my legal residence address on my voter registration record to the above residence address (check box, if applicable)

Voter Registration Number __________________ or Date of Birth __________________

I am a registered voter of Hillsborough County, Florida and hereby petition the Supervisor of Elections to place the following proposed amendment to the Hillsborough County Charter on the ballot in the general election:

BALLOT TITLE: Funding for Countywide Transportation and Road Improvements by County Charter Amendment

BALLOT SUMMARY:

Should transportation improvements be funded throughout Hillsborough County, including Tampa, Plant City, Temple Terrace, Brandon, Town 'n' Country, and Sun City, including projects that:

- Improve roads and bridges,
- Expand public transit options,
- Fix potholes,
- Enhance bus services,
- Relieve rush hour bottlenecks,
- Improve intersections, and
- Make walking and biking safer,

By amending the County Charter to enact a one-cent sales surtax levied for 30 years and deposited in an audited trust fund with independent oversight?

___ Yes
___ No

ARTICLE AND SECTION BEING CREATED OR AMENDED: Article 11

FULL TEXT OF THE PROPOSED COUNTY CHARTER AMENDMENT:

XI. SURTAX FOR TRANSPORTATION IMPROVEMENTS

Section 11.01. Purpose of Surtax. The purpose of the surtax levied in accordance with Section 11.02 below is to fund transportation improvements throughout Hillsborough County, including road and bridge improvements; the expansion of public transit options; fixing potholes; enhancing bus service; relieving rush hour bottlenecks; improving intersections; and making walking and biking safer. The proceeds of the surtax shall be distributed and disbursed in compliance with F.S. § 212.055(1) and in accordance with the provisions of this Article 11.
Section 11.02. Levy of One-Cent Surtax to Fund Transportation Improvements. There shall be levied throughout the incorporated and unincorporated areas of Hillsborough County an additional tax imposed on sales, use, services, rentals, admissions, and other transactions by Chapter 212, Florida Statutes, and communications services as defined by Chapter 202, Florida Statutes, at the rate of one cent for each $1.00 of the sales price or actual value received, and for each fractional part of $1.00 of the sales price or actual value received (the “Transportation Surtax”). The Transportation Surtax shall be levied and imposed in accordance with F.S. §§ 212.054 and 212.055(1), the rules promulgated by the Florida Department of Revenue, and this Article 11. Any other provision of this Charter to the contrary notwithstanding, all proceeds from the Transportation Surtax, including any interest earnings and bond proceeds generated therefrom, shall be expended only as permitted by this Article 11, F.S. § 212.055(1), and in accordance with the purpose set forth in Section 11.01 above. For purposes of this Article 11, Hillsborough County, Florida (the “County”), each municipality, as defined in F.S. § 165.031, that is located in the County (the “Municipalities”), and the Hillsborough Area Regional Transit Authority or its successor (“HART”) are each an “Agency” and collectively, the “Agencies.” “Independent Oversight Committee” shall refer to the committee mandated and governed by Section 11.10 below.

Section 11.03. Duration of Transportation Surtax. The Transportation Surtax authorized by this Article 11 shall be effective commencing January 1, 2019, and shall remain in effect for a period of thirty (30) years.

Section 11.04. Duties of the Clerk. The Clerk of the Circuit Court of Hillsborough County, Florida (the “Clerk”) shall receive the proceeds of the Transportation Surtax (the “Surtax Proceeds”) from the Florida Department of Revenue and act as trustee thereof and shall retain all Surtax Proceeds in a separate account until disbursed in accordance with this Section 11.04 and the distribution allocations provided for in Section 11.05. Disbursements of the Surtax Proceeds in accordance with the distribution allocations provided in Section 11.05 shall be made to the Agencies by the Clerk within five (5) business days of the Clerk’s receipt of Surtax Proceeds from the Florida Department of Revenue. Additionally, the Clerk shall provide, on behalf of the board of county commissioners, the notices to the Florida Department of Revenue required by F.S. §§ 212.054(7)(a) and (b), and any other notices that must be delivered to the Department of Revenue or the State of Florida as required by applicable law. The Clerk shall engage an independent accounting firm to conduct an annual, independent audit of the distribution and expenditure of all Surtax Proceeds, which shall be completed within six (6) months after the end of the fiscal year being audited, for the purpose of determining the Clerk’s and each Agency’s compliance with the provisions of this Article relating to the distribution and expenditure of Surtax Proceeds during such fiscal year. For the duration of the period in which the Transportation Surtax is in effect, the board of county commissioners shall appropriate County funds to the Clerk on an annual basis to permit the Clerk to carry out the annual audit of Surtax Proceeds described in this Section 11.04.

Section 11.05. Distribution of Surtax Proceeds. The Surtax Proceeds shall be deposited in a dedicated trust fund (the “Trust Fund”) maintained by the Clerk and distributed in accordance with the following formula:

1. General Purpose Portion. Fifty-four percent (54%) of the Surtax Proceeds (the “General Purpose Portion”) shall be distributed to the County and to each Municipality in accordance with their relative populations as calculated utilizing the statutory formula provided in F.S. § 218.62 (the “Distribution Formula”) and be expended by the County and each Municipality in accordance with Section 11.07. The County and each Municipality may elect to bond or otherwise encumber their respective distribution of the Surtax Proceeds allocated pursuant to this Section 11.05(1), and shall provide notice of such election to the other recipients of the General Purpose Portion at least ninety (90) days prior to issuing bonds.

2. Transit Restricted Portion. Forty-five percent (45%) of the Surtax Proceeds (the “Transit Restricted Portion”) shall be distributed to HART and be expended by HART in accordance with Section 11.08. Subject to compliance with applicable law and the charter of HART, HART may elect to directly, or through the County, bond or otherwise encumber the Transit Restricted Portion.

3. Planning and Development Portion. One percent (1%) of the Surtax Proceeds (the “Planning and Development Portion”) shall be distributed to the metropolitan planning organization described in F.S. § 339.175 whose jurisdiction includes Hillsborough County (the “MPO”). The Planning and Development Portion shall be expended by the MPO on planning and development purposes, including data collection, analysis, planning, and grant funding to assist the Agencies and the Independent Oversight Committee in carrying out the purpose set forth in Section 11.01.

Section 11.06. Agency Project Plans. No later than September 30th of each year, each Agency shall deliver to the Independent Oversight Committee a plan (a “Project Plan”) setting forth the projects, including reasonable detail for each, on which such Agency will expend their distribution of the Surtax Proceeds for the following calendar year in accordance with the uses mandated by Sections 11.07 and 11.08 below. Each Project Plan must be approved by the governing body of the applicable Agency and by a majority vote of the Independent Oversight Committee at a public hearing. No Agency may expend Surtax Proceeds for any purpose other than implementation of each of the projects set forth in such Agency’s Project Plan, and each Agency shall diligently and prudently pursue implementation of each of the projects set forth in such Agency’s Project Plan. If any Agency desires to amend its Project Plan after the Independent Oversight Committee has approved the same, the Independent
Oversight Committee shall approve or disapprove (and state the basis therefore) the amended Project Plan within thirty (30) days of an Agency’s request to amend.

Section 11.07. Uses of General Purpose Portion. For any Agency that the Clerk reasonably estimates will receive five percent (5%) or more of the Surtax Proceeds in a given calendar year, such Agency’s share of the General Purpose Portion shall be expended by the Agencies for the planning, development, construction, operation, and maintenance of roads, bridges, sidewalks, intersections, and public transportation (which, for purposes of this Section, may include any technological innovations such as autonomous vehicles and related infrastructure), to the extent permitted by F.S. § 212.055(1), and include expenditures in the following categories:

(1) Maintenance and Vulnerability Reduction. At least twenty percent (20%) of the General Purpose Portion shall be expended on projects that: (i) improve, repair and maintain existing streets, roads, and bridges, including fixing potholes, or (ii) reduce congestion and transportation vulnerabilities.

(2) Congestion Reduction. At least twenty-six (26%) of the General Purpose Portion shall be expended to relieve rush hour bottlenecks and improve the flow of traffic on existing roads and streets and through intersections. Expenditures in the category described in this Section 11.07(2) may include projects that improve intersection capacity through the use of technology, the construction of new intersections, the redevelopment of existing intersections, and may include related infrastructure such as roundabouts and turn lanes. Projects described in the foregoing sentence do not constitute New Automobile Lane Capacity, as defined in Section 11.07(8) below.

(3) Transportation Safety Improvements. At least twenty-seven (27%) of the General Purpose Portion shall be expended to promote transportation safety improvements on existing streets, roads and bridges.

(4) Transportation Network Improvements. At least twelve (12%) of the General Purpose Portion shall be expended on bicycle or pedestrian infrastructure and related improvements that make walking and biking safer, to the extent the foregoing is or is planned to become a part of the transportation network within any Agency’s jurisdiction, and to the extent permitted by F.S. § 212.055(1).

(5) Remaining Funds. Any remaining portions of the General Purpose Portion shall be expended on any project to improve transportation in the applicable Agency’s jurisdiction to the extent permitted by F.S § 212.055(1) and this Article.

(6) Inter-Agency Distributions. Notwithstanding anything to the contrary set forth in this Section 11.07, the County and each Municipality may distribute any amount of its share of General Purpose Portion to any Agency (an “Agency Distribution”). For purposes of this Section, any Agency’s share of the General Purpose Portion shall be reduced, or increased, by the amount of the Agency Distribution distributed, or received, as the case may be.

(7) Small Agency Distributions. Notwithstanding anything to the contrary set forth in this Section 11.07, any Agency that receives five percent (5%) or less of the Surtax Proceeds in any given calendar year, on an annualized basis, is not required to expend its share of General Purpose Portion on the categories set forth in Section 11.07(1) through (5) above, and shall instead expend its distribution of the Surtax Proceeds on any purpose consistent with Section 11.01 and permitted by F.S. § 212.055(1).

(8) Limits on New Automobile Lane Capacity. Agencies are prohibited from expending any funds from the categories mandated by Section 11.07(1), (2) and (3) above on New Automobile Lane Capacity. For purposes of this Section 11.07(8), “New Automobile Lane Capacity” means projects that consist of (i) adding additional lanes for automobile traffic to existing roads or streets that are not related to intersection capacity improvement, or (ii) constructing new roads or streets.

(9) Reallocations of Expenditure Categories. Upon request by an Agency, which request must be approved by seventy-five percent (75%) of the Independent Oversight Committee, the General Purpose Portion expenditure allocations mandated in Sections 11.07(1) through (3) above may instead be expended on any project to improve transportation within such Agency’s jurisdiction to the extent permitted by F.S § 212.055(1) and this Article if, in the opinion of the requesting Agency, any of the percentages set forth in Sections 11.07(1) through (3) exceed the amounts required to fulfill the purpose set forth therein.

Section 11.08. Uses of Transit Restricted Portion. The Transit Restricted Portion, and any Agency Distribution received by HART, shall be spent by HART for the planning, development, construction, operation, and maintenance of public transportation projects located solely in Hillsborough County, which are consistent with the HART Transit Development Plan, as adopted and amended from time to time by the HART board of directors, to the extent permitted by F.S. § 212.055(1), and include expenditures in the following categories:

(1) Enhancing Bus Services. No less than forty-five percent (45%) of the Transit Restricted Portion shall be spent on bus services, including express, neighborhood, circulator, paratransit, and all other types of transit now or hereafter operated by
HART. HART shall consider the following factors in determining the projects included in its Project Plan for this purpose: existing transit ridership; increasing existing service; expanding service to more residents; existing and future land use; and the availability and feasibility of obtaining third party funding sources to fund any portions of the Project Plan.

(2) Expanding Public Transit Options. No less than thirty-five percent (35%) of the Transit Restricted Portion shall be spent on transit services that utilize exclusive transit right-of-way for at least seventy-five percent (75%) of the length of the applicable service. HART shall consider the following factors in determining the projects included in its Project Plan for this purpose: existing transit ridership; utilizing or extending existing fixed guideways and rights-of-way; increasing existing service; expanding service to more residents; existing and future land use; and the availability and feasibility of obtaining third party funding sources to fund any portions of the Project Plan.

(3) Remaining Funds. Any remaining portions of the Transit Restricted Portion shall be spent on any project to improve public transportation permitted by F.S. § 212.055(1) or this Charter.

Section 11.09. Suspension of Distribution. In the event it is determined by a two-thirds majority of the Independent Oversight Committee that an Agency has failed to comply with any term or condition of this Article 11 and such Agency fails to correct such non-compliance within reasonable periods of time determined by the Independent Oversight Committee, but not more than ninety (90) days following written notice of such noncompliance, the Independent Oversight Committee may direct that distributions of the Surtax Proceeds to such Agency be suspended by the Clerk and held by the Clerk in the Trust Fund until such time as the Agency has cured the non-compliance, at which point distributions of the Surtax Proceeds to such Agency shall re-commence and any withheld Surtax Proceeds shall be distributed to the Agency.

The foregoing shall not apply to any portion of Surtax Proceeds encumbered by bond indebtedness pursuant to law; provided, however, that the financing instruments for such bond indebtedness include covenants requiring the Agency to comply with the terms and conditions of this Charter.

Section 11.10. Independent Oversight Committee. To ensure that the Transportation Surtax is successfully implemented, independent oversight of the distribution and expenditure of the Surtax Proceeds shall be provided by an Independent Oversight Committee, which shall be composed of Hillsborough County residents appointed by the following bodies: (i) four (4) individuals appointed by the board of county commissioners, and of which two are Experts (as defined below) in either transportation, planning, sustainability, engineering, or construction; (ii) one (1) from each Municipality, appointed by the mayor thereof; (iii) one (1) additional member from each Municipality for each 200,000 residents in such Municipality, appointed by the legislative body of that Municipality, based on population estimates published annually by the State of Florida; (iv) two (2) from HART, appointed by the HART board of directors; (v) one (1) attorney, who is a member of the Florida Bar, appointed by the Clerk; (vi) one (1) land use or real estate Expert appointed by the Hillsborough County Property Appraiser; and (vii) one (1) certified public accountant appointed by the Hillsborough County Tax Collector. No person then currently serving as an elected or appointed city, county, special district, state, or federal public office holder shall be eligible to serve as a member of the Independent Oversight Committee. Additionally, no member of the Independent Oversight Committee may be an employee of, independent contractor of, or otherwise be materially engaged for remuneration by any public or private recipient of Surtax Proceeds. Independent Oversight Committee members shall serve terms of three (3) years, without compensation, and each shall serve at the pleasure of the appointing body. The Independent Oversight Committee may make and adopt such by-laws, rules and regulations for its own guidance and for the oversight of the Transportation Surtax as it may deem expedient and not inconsistent with this Charter. The Independent Oversight Committee shall have only those powers and duties specifically vested in it by this Section 11.10. A majority of the members of the Independent Oversight Committee shall constitute a quorum, and the Independent Oversight Committee may conduct business only when a quorum is present. For the duration of the period in which the Transportation Surtax is in effect, the board of county commissioners shall appropriate County funds on an annual basis for the administrative expenses of the Independent Oversight Committee in an amount sufficient for the Independent Oversight Committee to fulfill its duties under this Article 11. For purposes of this Section 11.10, "Expert" means an individual who has at least seven years of experience in their respective subject matter area, and possesses professional accreditations or degrees that are typical of an expert in their respective subject matter area. The Independent Oversight Committee shall have the powers and duties set forth below:

(1) Review the results of the annual audit described in Section 11.04 and make findings as to whether the Clerk and each Agency has complied with the terms of this Article. Such findings shall include a determination as to whether Surtax Proceeds have been distributed as provided in this Article and whether the Surtax Proceeds have been expended in compliance with applicable state law, this Article, and any additional requirements that an Agency may have lawfully adopted.

(2) Approve Project Plans and approve and certify as to whether the projects therein comply with this Article.

(3) Prepare an annual report to the Clerk and each Agency presenting the results of the annual audit process and any findings made. The Independent Oversight Committee shall cause a summary of the annual report to be published in a local newspaper and ensure that the report and annual audit are available online and are delivered to every library located within the County for
public review. The Independent Oversight Committee shall hold a public hearing on each audit and annual report and shall report the comments of the public to each Agency.

(4) Review any projects proposed by citizens for inclusion in an Agency’s Project Plan, and forward them to the appropriate Agency for consideration.

Section 11.11. Miscellaneous.

(1) Prohibited Uses. No Surtax Proceeds may be used for any of the following uses: (i) expansion of right of way or width of the interstate highway system; (ii) construction of a sports facility or any other facility not related to transportation; or (iii) any other use expressly prohibited by law.

(2) Severability. To the extent that any mandated expenditure category set forth in Section 11.07 or 11.08 is deemed by a court of competent jurisdiction to be an impermissible use of Surtax Proceeds, the funds allocated to such impermissible use shall be expended by the applicable Agency on any project to improve public transportation permitted by F.S § 212.055(1) and this Article.

(3) Supremacy. This Article 11 shall at all times be interpreted in a manner consistent with the laws of Florida, and in the event of any conflict between the provisions of this Article 11 and the laws of Florida, the laws of Florida shall prevail.
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Funding for Countywide Transportation and Road Improvements
by County Charter Amendment

Should transportation improvements be funded throughout Hillsborough County, including Tampa, Plant City, Temple Terrace, Brandon, Town ‘n’ Country, and Sun City, including projects that:

- Improve roads and bridges,
- Expand public transit options,
- Fix potholes,
- Enhance bus services,
- Relieve rush hour bottlenecks,
- Improve intersections, and
- Make walking and biking safer,

By amending the County Charter to enact a one-cent sales surtax levied for 30 years and deposited in an audited trust fund with independent oversight?

A new 1% sales surtax is in addition to the current 7% sales tax and is estimated to raise $276 million annually and $552 million the first two calendar years. Revenues will be shared by Hillsborough Area Regional Transit Authority (HART), Metropolitan Planning Organization; and, using a population-based formula, by Hillsborough County Board of County Commissioners, City of Tampa, Plant City, and City of Temple Terrace. Expenditures will be governed by the Charter Amendment.

Financiamiento para mejoras de transporte y viales en todo el condado mediante enmienda a la Carta del Condado

¿Deben financiarse mejoras de transporte en toda la extensión del Condado de Hillsborough, incluidos los sitios de Tampa, Plant City, Temple Terrace, Brandon, Town ‘n’ Country y Sun City, mediante proyectos destinados a fines tales como:

- Mejorar rutas y puentes;
- Ampliar las opciones de tránsito público;
- Arreglar baches;
- Mejorar los servicios de los autobuses,
- Aliviar los embotellamientos de las horas pico;
- Mejorar las intersecciones; y
- Aumentar la seguridad de peatones y ciclistas,

Por medio de una enmienda a la Carta del Condado con el fin de implementar un sobreimpuesto de un centavo sobre las ventas, recaudado durante 30 años y depositado en un fondo fiduciario auditado con supervisión independiente?

Un nuevo sobreimpuesto del 1% sobre las ventas se suma al actual impuesto del 7% sobre las ventas y se estima que recauda $276 millones anualmente y $552 millones durante los dos primeros años calendario. Las rentas se repartirán entre la Autoridad Regional del Tránsito del Área de Hillsborough (HART, por sus siglas en inglés), la Organización de Planificación Metropolitana; y, mediante la aplicación de una fórmula basada en la población, el Consejo de Comisionados del Condado de Hillsborough, City of Tampa, Plant City y City of Temple Terrace. Los gastos se regirán según lo establecido en la enmienda a la Carta.

- Yes / Sí
- No / No
NO. 12
CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENT
ARTICLE II, SECTION 8;
ARTICLE V, SECTION 13;
ARTICLE XII, NEW SECTION
LOBBYING AND ABUSE OF OFFICE BY PUBLIC OFFICERS

Expands current restrictions on lobbying for compensation by former public officers; creates restrictions on lobbying for compensation by serving public officers and former justices and judges; provides exceptions; prohibits abuse of a public position by public officers and employees to obtain a personal benefit.

Yes for Approval 360,619 votes
No for Rejection 137,300 votes

NO. 13
CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENT
ARTICLE X, NEW SECTION;
ARTICLE XII, NEW SECTION
ENDS DOG RACING

Phases out commercial dog racing in connection with wagering by 2020. Other gaming activities are not affected.

Yes for Approval 334,200 votes
No for Rejection 172,389 votes

FUNDING FOR COUNTYWIDE TRANSPORTATION AND ROAD IMPROVEMENTS BY COUNTY CHARTER AMENDMENT

Should transportation improvements be funded throughout Hillsborough County, including Tampa, Plant City, Temple Terrace, Brandon, Town ‘n’ Country, and Sun City, including projects that:
Improve roads and bridges,
Expand public transit options,
Fix potholes,
Enhance bus services,
Relieve rush hour bottlenecks,
Improve intersections, and
Make walking and biking safer,

By amending the County Charter to enact a one-cent sales surtax levied for 30 years and deposited in an audited trust fund with independent oversight?

A new 1% sales surtax is in addition to the current 7% sales tax and is estimated to raise $276 million annually and $552 million the first two calendar years. Revenues will be shared by Hillsborough Area Regional Transit Authority (HART); Metropolitan Planning Organization; and, using a population-based formula, by Hillsborough County Board of County Commissioners, City of Tampa, Plant City, and City of Temple Terrace. Expenditures will be governed by the Charter Amendment.

Yes for Approval 282,753 votes
No for Rejection 210,722 votes
Board & Committee Agenda Item

**Agenda Item**
Smart Cities Initiatives: Tampa

**Presenter**
Vik Bhide, City of Tampa

**Summary**
In 2018, the City of Tampa was recognized as one of the “21 Smart Cities to Watch,” by the technology-oriented news site, statescoop. Over the past year, the City has proactively initiated a number of transportation technologies and pilot projects to solve problems ranging from flooding and parking to congestion and safety. Vik Bhide will present a high-level overview of the City of Tampa’s Smart Cities Initiatives.

**Recommended Action**
None. For information only.

**Prepared By**
Johnny Wong, PhD, MPO Staff

**Attachments**
None.
Board & Committee Agenda Item

Agenda Item
Resilient Tampa Bay: Transportation Pilot Project

Presenter
Allison Yeh, AICP, LEED GA - MPO Staff

Summary

The Tampa Bay region is one of the most vulnerable areas in the country, experiencing frequent storm events and persistent flooding. The Hillsborough Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO), in collaboration with the Pinellas MPO, Pasco MPO, Tampa Bay Regional Planning Council, and the Florida Department of Transportation District 7, was awarded a Federal Highway Administration Resilience and Durability to Extreme Weather grant.

Each MPO is currently preparing their 2045 Transportation Plan (LRTP) update. New federal requirements state that LRTP updates must address “improving the resiliency and reliability of the transportation system and reducing or mitigating the stormwater impacts of surface transportation …” This pilot project will assist in meeting the new federal mandate, as well as inform the LRTP updates for three MPÖs and the regional LRTP.

The project officially kicked off on in August 2018. The project team has completed the data collection phase and is currently in the evaluation and initial stakeholder engagement process.

Staff will provide a status update for the project. Additional information can be found at http://www.planhillsborough.org/resilient-tampa-bay-transportation/

Recommended Action
None, for information only

Prepared By
Allison Yeh, MPO Staff

Attachments
None
Board & Committee Agenda Item

**Agenda Item**
MPO Bylaws Amendment

**Presenter**
Beth Alden, MPO Director

**Summary**
The MPO Bylaws establish the purpose, membership, and procedures of the MPO advisory committees and the board. Changes to the bylaws are brought to the board twice, initially as a status report, and subsequently as an action item. Today is the first presentation of two housekeeping amendments:

1. In a routine review of organizational policies regarding harassment at the MPO host agency, the Planning Commission, it was noted that there are no policies which apply to the conduct of the many members of the MPO advisory committees. Staff recommends adding a sentence to the bylaws to clarify that committee members can be dismissed by the MPO chair for violations of standards of conduct, defined as conduct inconsistent with Florida Senate Administrative Policies and Procedures (copy attached for reference).

2. The membership, structure and duties of the Transportation Disadvantaged Coordinating Board are defined in the Florida Administrative Code, Rule 41-2.012. Earlier this year, Rule 41-2.012 was amended to require a new voting member of the board, in every county: a local representative of the Agency for Persons with Disabilities. Staff recommends amending section 4.2.9 of the MPO Bylaws to reflect this change.

**Recommended Action**
None. Approval will be considered next month.

**Prepared By**
Michele Ogilvie, MPO Staff

**Attachments**
MPO Bylaws, with proposed new text highlighted
Florida Senate Administrative Policies and Procedures regarding harassment
1.0 PURPOSE: These By-laws are adopted by the Hillsborough County Metropolitan Planning Organization hereinafter called the “MPO” to govern the performance of the MPO’s duties as well as those of MPO committees and to inform the public of the nature of the MPO’s internal organization, operations and other related matters.

2.0 DEFINITIONS:

2.1 EMERGENCY: Any occurrence or threat thereof, whether accidental or natural, caused by man, in war or in peace, which necessitates immediate action because it results or may result in substantial injury or harm to the population or the MPO or substantial damage to or loss of property or public funds.

2.2 GOOD CAUSE: A substantial reason which is put forward in good faith.

2.3 INTERESTED PERSON: Any person who has or may have or who represents any group or entity which has or may have some concern, participation or relation to any matter which will or may be considered by the MPO.

2.4 MEMBER(S): The MPO consists of sixteen (16) official members, with FDOT designated as a non-voting advisor. Each member government or authority may also appoint an alternate member, who may vote at any MPO meeting in place of a regular member. MPO committee membership is as provided in these By-laws.

2.5 PUBLIC HEARING: A meeting of the MPO convened for the purpose of receiving public testimony regarding a specific subject and for the purpose of taking action on amendment to or adoption of a plan or program. A public hearing may be convened with less than a quorum present; however, no official action other than adjournment or continuation of the public hearing to another time may be taken unless a quorum is present.

2.6 REGULAR MEETING: The regular scheduled meeting of the MPO at which all official business may be transacted.

2.7 SPECIAL MEETING: A meeting of the MPO held at a time other than the regularly scheduled meeting time. All official business may be transacted at a special meeting.

2.8 WORKSHOP: A conference where members are present and are meeting to discuss a specific subject. A workshop may be convened with less than a
quorum present; however, no official action other than adjournment or continuation of the workshop to another time may be taken.

3.0 **MPO OFFICERS:** There shall be a Chair and a Vice-Chair. All officers shall be voting members of the MPO.

3.1 **TENURE:** All officers shall hold office for one (1) year or until a successor is elected. However, any officer may be removed by a majority of the total members.

3.2 **SELECTION:** At the regular meeting in December, the members shall nominate one or more candidates to fill each office. Immediately following the close of nominations, the MPO shall vote to fill each office, with the vote for each office being taken in the order in which candidates for that office were nominated, until one is elected. New officers shall take office immediately upon the conclusion of the election of officers.

3.3 **VACANCY IN OFFICE:** A vacant office shall be filled by the MPO at its first regular meeting following the vacancy. The officer so elected shall serve the remainder of their predecessor’s term in office.

3.4 **DUTIES:** The officers shall have the following duties:

3.4.1 **CHAIR:** The Chair shall:

(a) Preside at all regular and special meetings, workshops and public hearings.
(b) Represent the MPO on the West Central Florida MPO Chairs Coordinating Committee (CCC) and the Florida MPO Advisory Council (MPOAC).
(c) Establish such ad hoc committees as the Chair may deem necessary and appoint their members and chairs.
(d) Call special meetings and workshops and public hearings.
(e) Sign all contracts, resolutions, and other official documents of the MPO, unless otherwise specified by the By-laws or Policies.
(f) Express the position of the MPO as determined by vote or consensus of the MPO.
(g) See that all actions of the MPO are taken in accordance with the By-laws, Policies and applicable laws.
(h) Perform such duties as are usually exercised by the Chair of a commission or board, and perform such other duties as may from time to time be assigned by the MPO.

3.4.2 **Vice-Chair:** the Vice-Chair shall, during the absence of the Chair or the Chair’s inability to act, have and exercise all of the duties and powers of the Chair, and shall perform such other duties as may from time to time be assigned to the Chair by the MPO.

4.0 **COMMITTEES:**
4.1 AD HOC COMMITTEES:

4.1.1 Chair and Expiration: An ad hoc committee shall consist of a committee chair, who shall be a member of the MPO. All ad hoc committees shall have an expiration time identified by the Chair at the time of creation or shall dissolve at the expiration of the Chair’s term.

4.1.2 Purpose: The purpose of establishing ad hoc committees is to facilitate the accomplishment of a specific task identified by the Chair.

4.2 STANDING COMMITTEES:

4.2.1 Appointment of Committee Members: Members and alternate members of all committees shall be appointed by action of the MPO. Members representing an organization on a committee, as specified in the committee membership list, shall be nominated in writing by their organization. Members representing the citizens of Hillsborough County, and not representing any particular entity as specified in the committee membership list, shall be recommended for membership by action of the committee on which they would like to serve. Using the same procedure, alternate members may be designated to act on behalf of regular members with all the privileges accorded thereto. The MPO shall not appoint committee applicants who are affiliated with private MPO consultants or contractors. If such an affiliation occurs, an existing committee member shall be deemed to have resigned.

4.2.2 Termination of Committee Membership: Any member of any committee may resign at any time by notice in writing to the Chair. Unless otherwise specified in such notice, such resignation shall take effect upon receipt thereof by the Chair. Each member of each committee is expected to demonstrate his/her interest in the committee’s activities through attendance of the scheduled meetings, except for reasons of an unavoidable nature. In each instance of an unavoidable absence, the absent member should ensure that his/her alternate will attend. The MPO may review, and consider rescinding, the appointment of any member of any committee who fails to attend three (3) consecutive meetings. In each case, the MPO will warn the member in writing, and if applicable the member’s nominating organization, thirty days in advance of an action to rescind membership. The MPO Chair may immediately terminate the membership of any committee member for violations of standards of conduct, defined as conduct inconsistent with Florida Senate Administrative Policies and Procedures. At a minimum, committee member attendance will be reviewed annually. In the case of members representing an organization on a committee as specified in the committee membership list, the individual’s membership may also be rescinded by the nominating organization, by letter to the Chair.
4.2.3 **Officers of Standing Committees:** The committee shall hold an organizational meeting each year for the purpose of electing a committee chair (unless designated by the MPO), a committee vice-chair, and, at the discretion of the committee chair, an officer-at-large. Officers shall be elected by a majority vote of a quorum of the members. Except as otherwise provided in these By-laws, officers shall serve a term of one year starting with the next meeting. The powers and duties of the committee chair shall be to preside at all meetings; to express the position of the committee as determined by vote or consensus of the committee; and to ensure that all actions of the committee are taken in accordance with the bylaws and applicable law. The committee vice chair shall have these same powers and responsibilities in the absence of the committee chair. The officer-at-large shall, during the absence of both the committee chair and the committee vice-chair or their inability to act, have these same duties and responsibilities, and in addition shall perform other duties as may from time to time be assigned by the committee chair.

4.2.4 **Conduct of Committee Meetings:** Sections 5 through 9, excluding Section 8.1, of these MPO By-laws shall be used for the conduct of all MPO committee meetings.

4.2.5 **Standing Committee Sub-Committees:** An MPO standing committee or the MPO may establish such sub-committees to a standing committee as deemed necessary to investigate and report on specific subject areas within the scope of the standing committee. Such sub-committees shall be of limited duration and shall dissolve at such time as designated at the time of establishment or upon completion of the task(s) specified at the time of establishment. These MPO By-laws shall be used for the conduct of such sub-committees meetings in the same manner as the MPO committees.

4.2.6 **MPO Technical Advisory Committee (TAC):** Established pursuant to Section 339.175, Florida Statutes, the TAC shall be responsible for considering safe access to schools in the review of transportation project priorities, long-range transportation plans and transportation improvement programs and shall advise the MPO on such matters. In addition, the TAC shall be responsible for assisting in the development of transportation planning work programs; coordinating transportation planning and programming; review of all transportation studies, reports, plans and/or programs, and making recommendations to the MPO that are pertinent to the subject documents based upon the technical sufficiency, accuracy, and completeness of and the needs as determined by the studies, plans and/or programs. The TAC shall coordinate its actions with the School Board of Hillsborough County and other local programs and organizations within Hillsborough County that participate in school safety activities and shall also coordinate its actions with the
appropriate representatives of the Florida Department of Transportation.

**TAC Membership:** The TAC shall be composed of technically qualified representatives for the purpose of planning, programming and engineering of the transportation system within the Hillsborough County Metropolitan Planning Organization area boundary.

The membership shall be composed of: two (2) members from Hillsborough County, two (2) members from City of Tampa, two (2) members from the Hillsborough County City-County Planning Commission, one (1) member from the Tampa Hillsborough Expressway Authority, one (1) member from the Hillsborough Area Regional Transit Authority, one (1) member from Environmental Protection Commission, one (1) member from the Tampa Port Authority, one (1) member from City of Temple Terrace, one (1) member from the Tampa Bay Regional Planning Council, one (1) member from the Florida Department of Environmental Protection, one (1) member from City of Plant City, one (1) member from the Hillsborough County Aviation Authority, one (1) member from the Hillsborough County School Board, one (1) member from the Tampa Bay Area Regional Transportation Authority, one (1) member from the Tampa Historic Streetcar, Inc., one (1) member from the Department of Health-Hillsborough and one (1) member from the Florida Trucking Association.

**Terms of Membership:** Members shall serve terms of indefinite length at the pleasure of their respective nominating organizations and the MPO.

**4.2.7 MPO Citizens Advisory Committee (CAC):** The CAC shall be responsible for providing information and overall community values and needs into the transportation planning program of the MPO; evaluating and proposing solutions from a citizens perspective concerning alternative transportation proposals and critical issues; providing knowledge gained through the CAC into local citizen group discussions and meetings; and establishing comprehension and promoting credibility for the MPO Program.

**CAC Membership:** The CAC shall be composed of appointed citizens (transportation agency staff are not eligible) who together shall represent a broad spectrum of social and economic backgrounds and who have an interest in the development of an efficient, safe and cost-effective transportation system. Minorities, the elderly and persons with disabilities must be adequately represented on the CAC.

All members must be residents of Hillsborough County. Membership will be as follows: one (1) member nominated by each member of the Board of County Commissioners serving on the MPO, one (1) member nominated by each member from the City of Tampa serving
on the MPO, one (1) member from the City of Temple Terrace nominated by the Mayor of the City of Temple Terrace, one (1) member from the City of Plant City nominated by the Mayor of the City of Plant City, one (1) member nominated by each respective Chairperson of the Hillsborough County Aviation, Tampa-Hillsborough Expressway, Tampa Port and Hillsborough Area Regional Transit Authorities, one (1) member representing the transportation disadvantaged nominated by the Chairman of the Transportation Disadvantaged Coordinating Board, one (1) member nominated by the Chairperson of the Hillsborough County City-County Planning Commission and one (1) member nominated by the School Board member serving on the MPO. In addition, there shall be six (6) at-large members nominated by local organizations representing the following constituencies or through application directly to the CAC as provided in Section 4.2.1. These shall comprise one (1) person of Hispanic ethnicity, one (1) person of African-American descent, one (1) person under the age of 30, one (1) woman, one (1) person to represent neighborhoods, and one (1) person to represent the business community.

Terms of appointment shall be for a two-year period with an opportunity for reappointment thereafter, unless the official who appointed the member leaves office or the MPO board during the term of the member’s appointment. In that case, the member shall be deemed to have resigned from the CAC and the new official shall have the right to appoint a new member or reappoint the same member. A member of the committee whose term has expired shall continue to serve until they are reappointed or replaced. The terms of appointment notwithstanding, CAC members shall serve at the pleasure of the MPO.

4.2.8 MPO Policy Committee: The MPO Policy Committee shall be responsible for the review and in-depth discussion of items and issues proposed to come before the MPO and for development of recommendations to the MPO, as appropriate, regarding such items and issues in order to facilitate the accomplishment of the MPO’s responsibilities to manage a continuing, cooperative and comprehensive transportation planning process and the development of transportation plans and programs.

Membership: The Policy Committee shall be composed of at least five (5) members of the MPO who shall serve on a voluntary basis. Volunteers for membership will be solicited at the MPO meeting at which the Chair is elected and at any MPO meeting thereafter if the total membership of the Policy Committee falls below five (5). Those MPO members requesting to be made Policy Committee members in response to such solicitation or upon the initiative of an individual MPO member shall be so appointed by action of the MPO and shall serve terms that last until the next MPO meeting at which the Chair is elected.
4.2.9 Transportation Disadvantaged Coordinating Board (TDCB): The primary purpose of the TDCB is to assist the MPO in identifying local service needs and providing information, advice, and direction to the Community Transportation Coordinator (CTC) on the coordination of services to be provided to the transportation disadvantaged pursuant to Section 427.0157, Florida Statutes.

The following agencies or groups shall be represented on the TDCB as voting members:

- an elected official serving on the Hillsborough County MPO who has been appointed by the MPO to serve as TDCB Chairperson;
- a local representative of the Florida Department of Transportation;
- a local representative of the Florida Department of Children & Families;
- a local representative of the Public Education Community, which could include, but is not limited to, a representative of Hillsborough County Public Schools, School Board Transportation Office or Headstart Program;
- a local representative of the Florida Division of Vocational Rehabilitation or the Division of Blind Services, representing the Department of Education;
- a person recommended by the local Veterans Service Office representing the veterans in the county;
- a person who is recognized by the Florida Association for Community Action (President) as representing the economically disadvantaged in the county;
- a person over sixty years of age representing the elderly citizens in the county;
- a person with a disability representing the disabled citizens in the county;
- two citizen advocates in the county, one of whom must be a user of the transportation services of the coordinated transportation disadvantaged system as their primary means of transportation;
- a local representative for children at risk;
- the chairperson or designee of the local mass transit system's board except when they are also the CTC;
- a local representative of the Florida Department of Elder Affairs;
- a local representative of the local for-profit transportation industry;
- a local representative of the Florida Agency for Health Care Administration;
- a local representative of the Regional Workforce Development Board; and,
- a representative of the local medical community, which may include, but is not limited to, kidney dialysis centers, long term
care facilities, assisted living facilities, hospitals, local health department or other home and community based services, and;

- A local representative of the Agency for Persons with Disabilities

TDCB Terms of Appointment. Except for the TDCB Chairperson, the members of the TDCB shall be appointed for three (3) year terms which shall be staggered equally among the membership. The TDCB Chairperson shall serve until elected term of office has expired or is otherwise replaced by the MPO.

TDCB Duties. The TDCB shall perform the following duties which include those specified in Chapter 41-2, Florida Administrative Code and Section 427.0157, Florida Statutes.

a. Maintain official meeting minutes, including an attendance roster, reflecting official actions and provide a copy of same to the Commission for the Transportation Disadvantaged and the MPO Chairperson;

b. Review and approve the CTC’s memorandum of agreement and the transportation disadvantaged service plan;

c. On a continuing basis, evaluate services provided under the transportation disadvantaged service plan. Not less than annually provide the MPO with an evaluation of the CTC’s performance relative to the standards adopted by the Commission for the Transportation Disadvantaged and the MPO. Recommendations relative to performance and the renewal of the CTC’s memorandum of agreement with the Commission for the Transportation Disadvantaged shall be included in the report;

d. In cooperation with the CTC, review and provide recommendations to the Commission for the Transportation Disadvantaged and the MPO on all applications for local, state, or federal funds relating to transportation of the transportation disadvantaged in the county to ensure that any expenditures within the county are provided in the most cost effective and efficient manner;

e. Review coordination strategies for service provision to the transportation disadvantaged in the county to seek innovative ways to improve cost effectiveness, efficiency, safety, working hours, and types of service in an effort to increase ridership to a broader population. Such strategies should also encourage multi-county and regional transportation service agreements between area CTCs and consolidation of adjacent counties when it is appropriate and cost effective to do so;

f. Appoint a Grievance Subcommittee to process, investigate, resolve complaints, and make recommendations to the TDCB for improvement of service from agencies, users, or potential users, of the systems in the county. This
Subcommittee shall meet as often as necessary to resolve complaints in a timely manner;
g. In coordination with the CTC, jointly develop applications for funds that may become available;
h. Prepare quarterly reports outlining the accomplishments and activities or other areas of interest to the Commission for the Transportation Disadvantaged and the MPO;
i. Consolidate the annual budget of local and federal government transportation disadvantaged funds estimates and forward them to the Commission for the Transportation Disadvantaged. A copy of the consolidated report shall also be used by the TDCB for planning purposes;
j. Develop and maintain a vehicle inventory and utilization plan of those vehicles purchased with transportation disadvantaged funds for inclusion in the transportation disadvantaged service plan for the Commission for the Transportation Disadvantaged;
k. Assist the MPO in preparing a Transportation Disadvantaged Element in their Transportation Improvement Program (TIP);
l. Assist the CTC in establishing eligibility guidelines and priorities with regard to the recipients of nonsponsored transportation disadvantaged services that are purchased with Transportation Disadvantaged Trust Fund moneys;
m. Work cooperatively with regional workforce boards established in Chapter 445, Florida Statutes, to provide assistance in the development of innovative transportation services for participants in the welfare transition program.

4.2.10 MPO Intelligent Transportation Systems (ITS) Committee: The ITS Committee is responsible for assisting in the development of Intelligent Transportation System (ITS) planning work programs, as well as reviewing ITS related studies, reports, plans, projects (including consistency with regional architecture and other standards and/or programs) and making recommendations to the MPO and/or other agencies. ITS Committee recommendations to the MPO shall be based upon the technical sufficiency, accuracy, and completeness of studies, plans and/or programs. The ITS Committee shall coordinate its actions with the appropriate representatives of the Florida Department of Transportation.

ITS Committee Membership: The ITS Committee shall be composed of members technically qualified in the planning, programming, engineering and/or implementation of intelligent transportation systems or projects within the Hillsborough County Metropolitan Planning Organization area boundary or in the case of the member nominated by the Environmental Protection Committee, technically qualified in the area of air quality impacts of transportation. The membership shall be composed of: one (1) member each from Hillsborough County, the City of Tampa, the
Environmental Protection Commission, Tampa-Hillsborough Expressway Authority, Hillsborough Area Regional Transit Authority, the City of Plant City and the City of Temple Terrace. Members and Alternate Members shall serve terms of indefinite length at the pleasure of their respective governmental bodies or agencies and the MPO.

4.2.11 MPO Bicycle/Pedestrian Advisory Committee (BPAC): The BPAC shall be responsible for making recommendations to the MPO, Hillsborough County, City of Tampa, City of Plant City, City of Temple Terrace, the Hillsborough County Environmental Protection Commission, the Florida Department of Transportation, the Southwest Florida Water Management District, and others, on matters concerning the planning, implementation and maintenance of a comprehensive bikeway and pedestrian system. In addition, the BPAC shall be responsible for studying and making recommendations concerning the safety, security, and regulations pertaining to bicyclists and pedestrians. The BPAC shall coordinate its actions with the appropriate representatives of the Florida Department of Transportation.

BPAC Membership: The BPAC shall be composed of up to twenty-five members. One member shall represent each of the following entities, except as noted: City of Tampa (three seats), City of Temple Terrace, City of Plant City, Hillsborough County (three seats), University of South Florida USF, the Environmental Protection Commission of Hillsborough County, the Hillsborough County City-County Planning Commission, HART, and the Florida Health Department. The remaining members shall be citizen representatives.

All members of this Committee shall serve for a two-year term, ending on June 30th of its respective year. Without restriction, each member can be appointed to serve an unlimited number of two-year terms.

4.2.12 MPO Livable Roadways Committee (LRC): The LRC shall be responsible for integrating Livable Roadways principles into the design and use of public rights-of-way and the major road network throughout Hillsborough County. The LRC seeks to accomplish this responsibility by: making recommendations to create a transportation system that balances design and aesthetics with issues of roadway safety and function; ensuring that public policy and decisions result in a transportation system that supports all modes of transportation, with a special emphasis on pedestrian and bicycle infrastructure and transit infrastructure and service; providing information and assistance to the MPO, local governments and transportation agencies relating to the mission of the Committee; and enhancing coordination among MPO member agencies and public participation in the transportation planning
process. The LRC shall coordinate its actions with the appropriate representatives of the Florida Department of Transportation.

LRC Membership: The LRC shall be composed of representatives of local government departments, transportation agencies and other organizations. They may be elected officials, appointed officials, organization members, designated representatives or staff, but may not be staff to the MPO. Members will represent the following: City of Plant City; City of Tampa Parks and Recreation Department, Public Works, Transportation Division, or Urban Development Department (up to two members); City of Temple Terrace; Hillsborough County Planning and Infrastructure (up to two members); Hillsborough Area Regional Transit; Hillsborough County MPO Board Member (appointed by the MPO to serve as chair of the committee); Hillsborough County City-County Planning Commission; Tampa Hillsborough Expressway Authority and five members from professional organizations whose mission is consistent with the principles of Livable Roadways (such as American Planning Association; American Society of Landscape Architects; Urban Land Institute; Institute of Transportation Engineers; Congress for New Urbanism and American Institute of Architects); University of South Florida; New North Transportation Alliance; Tampa Downtown Partnership; Westshore Alliance; Person with disabilities; Neighborhood representative; Transit user representative; Citizen advocate for livable communities and/or multimodal transportation.

5 MEETINGS:

5.1 SCHEDULE OF MPO MEETINGS:

5.1.1 Regular Meetings: Regular meetings shall take place on the first Tuesday of each month, unless otherwise decided by the MPO and shall be held in the Chamber of the Hillsborough County Board of County Commissioners or at another suitable location designated by the Chair.

5.1.2 Special Meetings and Workshops: Special meetings and workshops shall be held at the call of the Chair or majority of officers. Special meetings and workshops shall convene at a time designated by the Chair and shall be held in the Chambers of the Hillsborough County Board of County Commissioners or at another suitable location designated by the Chair.

5.1.3 Public Hearings: Public hearings of the MPO shall be held at a time designated by the Chair. A public hearing can be continued until a date and time certain, with due allowance of time for public notice of the continuation of the public hearing. Public hearings shall be held in the Chambers of the Hillsborough County Board of County Commissioners or at another suitable location designated by the Chair.
5.2 **SCHEDULE OF STANDING COMMITTEE MEETINGS:** Each standing committee shall meet monthly, with the exception of the Intelligent Transportation Systems Committee and the Transportation Disadvantaged Coordinating Board which shall meet every two months, at a regular date and time designated by the Chair.

5.3 **SCHEDULE OF AD HOC COMMITTEE MEETINGS:** Each ad hoc committee shall meet at the call of the committee chair. Ad hoc committee meetings shall not be scheduled during the times reserved for MPO meetings. Ad hoc committee meetings shall be held at a suitable location designated by the committee chair.

5.4 **NOTICE OF MPO AND COMMITTEE MEETINGS:** The Executive Director of the MPO shall be responsible for providing written public notice of all MPO meetings, public hearings and committee meetings. Except in case of emergencies, written notice of any meeting shall be given at least five (5) days prior to the meeting. In case of emergency, notice of such meeting shall be given to each member as far in advance of the meeting as possible and by the most direct means of communications. In addition, notice of such emergency meeting shall be given to the media, utilizing the most practicable method. Written notice of any meeting shall state the date, time and place of the meeting, a brief description of the agenda for the meeting, and shall be provided in accordance with the requirements of Florida law and the MPO's Public Participation Plan.

5.5 **AGENDA OF MPO AND COMMITTEE MEETINGS:** The agenda for all MPO regular and special meetings, workshops and public hearings shall be established by the Chair with the assistance of the Executive Director. Members or the Executive Director may request that an item be placed on the agenda by communicating such request to the Executive Director at least ten (10) days prior to the meeting date. The Chair shall consider with the Executive Director on a month to month basis whether there shall be a consent agenda.

The agenda for each committee meeting shall be established by the committee chair and shall be prepared by the Executive Director or designated MPO support staff. Members of a committee or the Executive Director may request that an item be placed on a committee agenda by communicating such request to the MPO support staff assigned to the committee, or the Executive Director at least ten (10) days prior to the committee meeting date.

The agenda shall list the items in the order they are to be considered. For good cause stated in the record, items on the agenda may be considered out of order with the approval of the MPO Chair or the committee chair.

The agenda for any MPO or committee meeting shall be delivered to each member at least five (5) days prior to the meeting date and shall be mailed or delivered to interested persons at that time, except in case of an
emergency meeting, where the agenda will be provided to members, and interested parties as far in advance of such meetings as practicable.

5.6 **RULES OF ORDER:** Except where they are inconsistent with the *By-laws*, *Roberts Rule of Order* shall be used for the conduct of all MPO and committee meetings.

5.7 **QUORUM:** A simple majority of the total non-vacant membership of the MPO or MPO committee shall constitute a quorum for the transaction of business at all regular and special meetings and public hearings, except seven (7) members shall constitute a quorum for the CAC. Public hearings may be conducted with less than a quorum, but no action, other than as noted at the end of this section, shall be taken unless a quorum is present. When a quorum is present, a majority of those present may take action on matters properly presented at the meeting. Workshops may be conducted with less than a quorum, but no official action may be taken. A majority of the members present, whether or not a quorum exists, may adjourn any meeting or continue any public hearing to another time.

5.8 **CONDUCT OF MEETINGS:**

5.8.1 Chair Participation: The presiding MPO Chair, or committee chair, shall not be deprived of any rights and privileges by reason of being presiding Chair, but may move or second a motion only after the gavel has been passed to the Vice-Chair or another member.

5.8.2 Form of Address: Each member shall address only the presiding Chair for recognition; shall confine his/her remarks to the question under debate; and shall avoid personalities or indecorous language or behavior.

5.8.3 Public Participation: Any member of the public may address the MPO or MPO committee at a regular or special meeting, public hearing, or public participation type workshop, after signing in with the MPO Staff for a specific item. When recognized by the Chair, a member of the public shall state their name, address, the person on whose behalf they are appearing and the subject of their testimony. Each member of the public shall limit his or her presentation to three (3) minutes unless otherwise authorized by the Chair.

5.8.4 Limitation of Testimony: The Chair may rule testimony out of order if it is redundant, irrelevant, indecorous or untimely.

5.8.5 Motions: The Chair shall restate motions before a vote is taken and shall state the maker of the motion and the name of the supporter.

5.8.6 Voting: Voting shall be done by voice, as a group, but a member shall have his/her vote recorded in the minutes of the meeting if so desired. A roll call vote shall be taken if any member so requests.
Any member may give a brief explanation of his/her vote. A tie vote shall result in failure of a motion.

5.8.7 Reconsideration: A motion to reconsider an item on which vote has been taken may be made only by a member who voted with the prevailing side. The motion to reconsider must be made on the day the vote to be reconsidered was taken, or at the next succeeding meeting of the same type of meeting at which the vote to be reconsidered was taken (i.e., at the next succeeding regular meeting if the vote to be reconsidered was taken at a regular meeting). To be in order, the motion to reconsider must be made under the consideration of old business. Adoption of a motion to reconsider requires the approval of at least a simple majority of the votes cast. If a motion to reconsider is adopted, the members shall consider the need for additional notice to interested persons before a vote subject to the motion for reconsideration was taken at a special meeting or a public hearing for which no subsequently scheduled meeting will provide an opportunity for reconsideration of the item, then the motion to reconsider may be made at the next regular meeting in the manner provided.

5.9 ORDER OF BUSINESS AT MEETINGS: The order of business shall be determined by the Chair; however, the following is provided as a guide:

5.9.1 Regular MPO Meetings:

(a) Call to Order and Pledge of Allegiance
(b) Approval of minutes of prior meetings, workshops and public hearings.
(c) Public input on Agenda Items, MPO Committee Reports
(d) Presentation of the Chair’s Report
(e) Presentation of the Executive Director’s Report
(f) Consideration of Action Items
(g) Consideration of Status Reports
(h) Public input regarding general concerns
(i) Consideration of items under old business
(j) Consideration of items under new business
(k) Adjournment

5.9.2 Special Meetings or Workshops

(a) Call to Order
(b) Consideration of individual agenda items
(c) Adjournment

5.9.3 Public Hearings

(a) Call to Order
(b) Consideration of individual agenda items
   1. Presentation by staff
   2. Public comment
3. Board deliberation
   (c) Adjournment

5.9.4 Order of Consideration of Action Items: The order of consideration of any individual agenda item shall be as follows unless otherwise authorized by the Chair:

   (a) Chair introduces the agenda item.
   (b) Staff presents the agenda item.
   (c) Other invited speaker(s) make presentations.
   (d) MPO or committee members ask questions.
   (e) Motion is made, seconded and debated.
   (f) Vote is taken.

The Chair may expand all time limitations established by this section.

5.9 OPEN MEETINGS: All MPO regular and special meetings, workshops and public hearings, MPO committee meetings, and all meetings of the committees are open to the public as provided by Florida's Government-in-the-Sunshine Law, Section 286.011, Florida Statutes.

6.0 ATTENDANCE: Members are expected to attend all regular and special meetings, public hearings and workshops of the MPO and its committees.

   6.1 EXCUSAL FROM MEETINGS: Each member who knows that his/her attendance at a regular or special meeting, public hearing or workshop will not be possible, shall notify the Executive Director, or committee support staff, of the anticipated absence and the reason thereof. The Executive Director, or committee support staff, shall communicate this information to the Chair who may excuse the absent member for good cause.

7.0 CODE OF ETHICS:

   7.1 COMPLIANCE WITH LAWS: Members shall comply with the applicable provisions of the Code of Ethics for Public Officers and Employees, Part III, Chapter 112, Florida Statutes.

   7.2 REQUESTS FOR INFORMATION: Members may request information readily available to the general public directly from the appropriate staff person. Requests for information not readily available to the general public, or information which would involve the expenditure of staff time in preparation or compilation, shall be made to the Executive Director, who may consult with the Chair for guidance.

   7.3 LOBBYING ACTIVITIES: Members shall use their discretion in conducting private discussions with interested persons regarding MPO business, as long as all interested persons are treated equally. Any written material received by a member in connection with a private discussion with an interested person shall be given to the Executive Director for distribution to other members and as appropriate, to staff.
7.4 **GOVERNMENT IN THE SUNSHINE:** Members shall refrain from participating in any private communications regarding MPO business involving two or more members. For purposes of this section, a private discussion is one that is not conducted in accordance with the requirements of Florida’s Government-in-the-Sunshine Law, Section 286.011, Florida Statutes.

Any written material received by a member in connection with MPO Business shall be given to the Executive Director or the member’s committee support staff for distribution to other members and as appropriate, to staff.

7.5 **STATEMENTS BY MEMBERS:** Members will from time to time be asked to give their opinions regarding matters which have been or will be considered by the MPO or one of its committees. No member shall be prohibited from stating his/her individual opinion on any matter; however, in doing so, each member shall take care to make clear that the opinion expressed is his/her own, and does not constitute the official position of the MPO or one of its committees.

8.0 **ADMINISTRATION:** The administration of MPO activities shall be accomplished through official actions of the MPO in accordance with the following guidelines:

8.1 **POLICIES:** The MPO shall adopt, by a vote of a majority of the total membership, *Policies* to guide the administration of the MPO. The *Policies* shall be published in conjunction with the *By-laws*. The *Policies* may be amended from time to time by a vote of a majority of the total voting membership of the MPO.

8.2 **STATUTES:** The MPO shall abide by legislation authorizing and specifying its duties and functions and all other requirements of Florida law.

8.3 **STAFF:** The staff of the MPO shall consist of the Executive Director and such additional employees as provided by the Hillsborough County City-County Planning Commission. The staff shall be directed by the Executive Director of the MPO.

9.0 **RULES OF CONSTRUCTION:** The following rules apply to the text of this document.

9.1 The particular controls the general.

9.2 The word “shall” is mandatory and not discretionary. The word “may” is permissive.

9.3 Words used in the present tense include the future; words used in the singular number shall include the plural and the plural the singular unless the context indicates the contrary.

9.4 Words not defined shall have the meaning commonly ascribed to them.
10.0 **AMENDMENT**: The *By-laws* may be amended by two-thirds majority vote of the total voting membership of the MPO. Any amendment shall be proposed at a regular meeting and voted upon the next regular meeting.
The Florida Senate Administrative Policies and Procedures

Policy 1.49

Effective January 18, 2018

1.49 Workplace Harassment Prohibited
The Senate is committed to providing a safe, professional environment for conducting the legislative business of the citizens of Florida. The Senate does not tolerate harassment toward any individual based on race, color, religion, sex, national origin, age, disability, or marital status. The Senate takes all allegations of harassment seriously and will take appropriate action to eliminate prohibited harassment.

Each Senator and employee has a responsibility to ensure harassment based on race, color, religion, sex, national origin, age, disability, or marital status does not occur in the workplace and must avoid conduct, both subtle and overt, that could be seen as prohibited harassment.

To achieve the Senate goal of providing a workplace free from unlawful harassment, the prohibited conduct described in this policy will not be tolerated, and there will be a prompt response to complaints of such harassment consistent with this policy or the Senate Rules, as applicable. The personal identifying information of an alleged victim of sexual harassment will be kept confidential and exempt from public records requirements pursuant to section 119.071(2)(n), Florida Statutes, to the fullest extent allowed by law.

Applicability
This policy is applicable to all Senate employees, Senators, lobbyists, and third parties. All agreements with agents, contractors, and vendors shall also contain provisions prohibiting harassment consistent with this policy.

For the purpose of this policy, the term:

(1) “Employee” means an individual employed by the Senate and includes an intern, Senate Page, volunteer, or other temporary or unpaid staff.

(2) “Lobbyist” means an individual registered to lobby both houses of the Florida Legislature or the Florida Senate pursuant to section 11.045, Florida Statutes.

(3) “Senator” means a current Florida State Senator.

(4) “Third party” means a member of the general public, member of the media, other legislative employee, or visitor to the Senate offices or committees.

Definition of Workplace Harassment
“Workplace harassment” means any:

(1) Harassment based on race, color, religion, sex, national origin, age, disability, or marital status, including verbal or physical behavior or conduct that denigrates or shows hostility or aversion toward an individual because of that individual’s race, color, religion, sex, national origin, age, disability, or marital status;

(2) Harassment based on an individual’s association with an individual because of that individual’s race, color, religion, sex, national origin, age, disability, or marital status;
(3) Harassment that has the purpose or effect of substantially interfering with an individual’s work performance or creating an intimidating, hostile, or offensive work environment; or

(4) Sexual harassment. While workplace harassment includes sexual harassment, sexual harassment raises issues that are unique in comparison to other types of workplace harassment. Therefore, sexual harassment warrants separate emphasis. “Sexual harassment” means unwelcome sexual advances, requests for sexual favors, and other verbal, nonverbal, or physical conduct of a sexual nature when:

(a) Submission to such conduct is made either explicitly or implicitly a term or condition of an individual’s employment;

(b) Submission to or rejection of such conduct by an individual is used as the basis for employment decisions affecting such individual; or

(c) Such conduct has the purpose or effect of unreasonably interfering with an individual’s work performance or creating an intimidating, hostile, or offensive working environment.

Examples of Workplace Harassment

The following examples are illustrative of conduct or communications that may constitute workplace harassment:

- Unwanted jokes or slurs with a sexual, racial, religious, ethnic, or similar content.
- Mimicking or imitating the characteristics of an individual based on race, religion, sex, national origin, age, disability, or marital status.
- Unwelcome remarks about an individual’s sexual anatomy, sexual capabilities, ethnic characteristics, religion, age, physical disabilities, or marital status.
- Unwanted physical contact.
- Hazing based on race, color, religion, sex, national origin, age, disability, or marital status.

The following examples are illustrative of conduct or communication, if unwelcome, which may constitute sexual harassment:

Verbal

- Sexual comments or innuendos about one's clothing, body, appearance, or sexual activity.
- Discussing sexual topics in the workplace, such as sexual practices or preferences or telling sexual jokes or stories.
- Using sexual words or phrases or words or phrases that can or should reasonably be taken as having sexual connotations.
- Implying that certain individuals must attend meetings or provide briefings when it is understood or should be understood the preference is not based on the substantive knowledge or experience of the individual.
- Making unwelcome calls or other communications to discuss matters of a personal nature outside of those required by professional conduct.
• Requesting or demanding sexual favors or suggesting that there is any connection between sexual behavior and any term or condition of employment or the outcome of any issue or matter, whether that connection be positive or negative.

Nonverbal
• Displaying sexually explicit pictures, cartoons, messages, or objects in the work area.
• Giving personal gifts of a sexual nature.
• Making sexually suggestive gestures.
• Making unwelcome visits outside the workplace.
• Sending emails, text messages, instant messages, or notes of any kind containing sexual images, cartoons, jokes, words, phrases, or content of a sexual nature.

Physical
• Kissing or hugging, unless welcome or clearly not objected to, when made in connection with a greeting or parting, such as a peck on the cheek.
• Patting, pinching, or intentionally brushing against an individual’s body.
• Unwelcome sexual contact of any kind.

Whether conduct or communications constitute workplace harassment depends upon the totality of the circumstances. In that regard, the following should be kept in mind:
(1) A single incident may or may not constitute workplace harassment.
(2) Whether a particular action is workplace harassment will depend on the facts and determinations made on a case-by-case basis.
(3) Conduct or communications that might be welcome to one individual may be unwelcome to another individual. Conduct or communications that might have been welcome between two individuals at one time may become unwelcome at any time.
(4) The examples are not exhaustive. Other conduct or a communication not expressly described in the examples may violate this policy.

Complaint Contacts
Any individual who experiences prohibited workplace harassment in the Senate may report the complaint to any of the following individuals:
(1) the Senate President;
(2) the Senate Chief of Staff;
(3) the Secretary of the Senate;
(4) the Senate Sergeant at Arms;
(5) the Human Resources Director of the Office of Legislative Services (Human Resources Director);
(6) an employee’s immediate supervisor;
a designee of opposite gender provided by any of the aforementioned contacts when practical. A list of opposite gender designees, if any, will be provided with annual training materials.

**Complaint Procedure**

Complaints reported to a complaint contact must be promptly communicated to the Human Resources Director for a complete investigation. Once notified, the Human Resources Director will promptly notify the Office of the Senate President, or the Senate President Pro Tempore with a copy to the Secretary of the Senate if the complaint is against the Senate President, of the complaint and attempt to resolve the issue informally. This will include discussing the issues with the individuals involved in the complaint and may include interviewing other personnel, as deemed appropriate. Supervisors, Human Resources staff, or the Senate General Counsel may be requested to assist the Human Resources Director with the facilitation of the informal resolution.

If no informal resolution is possible, or if the complainant or the Human Resources Director determines an informal resolution is not appropriate given the seriousness or severity of the allegation, the complainant will be requested to submit a formal, written complaint to the Human Resources Director. The written complaint must set forth the basis of the complaint, the reasons the complainant believes prohibited workplace harassment has occurred, the specific dates of the alleged harassment, identification of any witnesses to the harassment and any action the complainant believes would resolve the complaint.

Upon receipt of the written complaint, or when deemed appropriate by the Senate President or the Human Resources Director, the Human Resources Director may contact an independent, professional service provider who will conduct a further investigation into the allegations set forth in the complaint.

After appropriate investigation, a written report summarizing the issues raised in the complaint, as well as evidence collected during the investigation, will be prepared by the Human Resources Director or the service provider and submitted to the Office of the Senate President.

A copy of a formal complaint or a description of an informal complaint shall be retained by the Human Resources Director with a summary of how the complaint was resolved.

If the complaint is against the Senate President, the Human Resources Director will notify the Senate President Pro Tempore with a copy to the Secretary of the Senate.

In every case, the Human Resources Director shall provide the complainant with available resources for victims of workplace harassment and follow-up with the complainant, when appropriate, to ensure the complainant was able to access available resources.
Resolution
The Human Resources Director, upon completion of an investigation of a complaint, will provide a summary of any findings, and disciplinary recommendations when a violation by an employee is identified, to the Senate President and the Senate Chief of Staff.

The Senate President and the Senate Chief of Staff, in consultation with the Senate General Counsel, will promptly make a determination and take appropriate disciplinary and corrective action, if any, based on all of the evidence gathered during the investigation.

An employee who is found to have violated this policy is subject to discipline up to and including immediate termination from employment.

The Senate President will take appropriate action if the complaint involves any violations by a Senator or a third party in accordance with the Senate Rules. Appropriate action may include, with the consent and participation of the complainant, the filing of the complaint with the Chair of the Committee on Rules in accordance with the Senate Rules.

If the complaint is against the Senate President, the Senate President Pro Tempore, with the consent and participation of the complainant, will file a written complaint with the Chair of the Committee on Rules in accordance with the Senate Rules.

Confidentiality
Information regarding complaints should be limited to individuals who need to know in order to carry out the procedures in this policy. A complaint and related investigation will be kept as confidential as practicable; however, absolute confidentiality cannot be guaranteed as reporting to law enforcement, attorneys, the Commission on Ethics, or others responsible for taking action may be required.

Statutes address certain information that is either confidential and exempt or exempt from public records requirements in specific situations and for certain time periods (e.g., sections 119.071(2)(g), 119.071(2)(k)1., and 119.071(2)(n), Florida Statutes).

Reporting Encouraged
The goal of the Senate is to provide a workplace free from harassment of any type. The Senate takes allegations of harassment seriously and will respond to such allegations promptly. Every individual is encouraged to report prohibited harassment so that inappropriate behavior can be addressed quickly and eliminated.

Supervisor Responsibility
Each Senator or employee supervising other employees is responsible for making subordinates aware of the prohibited harassment policy and the means for reporting a complaint.

A copy of this policy will be provided to each new employee and each employee must acknowledge receipt of the policy.
All Senators and employees, especially those supervising others, are responsible for assuring the workplace is free from harassment.

Supervisors and Senators in receipt of a complaint, whether formal or informal, must promptly communicate the complaint to the Human Resources Director.

**Retaliation**

The Senate does not tolerate retaliation against any individual for having complained of workplace harassment or for having assisted or participated in an investigation of alleged workplace harassment. Any individual who believes he or she may have been the subject of retaliation for having complained of workplace harassment or for having assisted or participated in an investigation related to an allegation of workplace harassment should report that information to any of the complaint contacts listed in this policy. Any individual found to have engaged in retaliation will be subject to discipline up to and including immediate termination or other appropriate action.

**False Complaints**

Complaints of workplace harassment found to be intentionally or recklessly dishonest or malicious will not be tolerated and shall be subject to discipline up to and including immediate termination or other appropriate action.

**Training**

**Employees**

Every employee shall receive a copy of this policy at the start of employment and shall return a signed acknowledgment prior to receiving access to Senate facilities or systems acknowledging the employee has read and understands the policy. Employees are encouraged to ask questions of their immediate supervisors if they do not understand the policy. Every employee shall receive a minimum of one (1) hour of training annually through online, classroom, or other appropriate training methods provided by the Senate on the topics of workplace harassment, sexual harassment, and sensitivity. Such training shall include verification through testing that the employee understands the concepts presented in the training and an opportunity for the employee to provide feedback.

Except as provided in this paragraph, volunteers, interns, and other temporary or unpaid staff of the Senate are required to receive the same training and provide the same acknowledgment of this policy as paid employees of the Senate. When requesting a volunteer, intern, or other temporary or unpaid staff, a Senator or the Senate Administration Director may request in writing that such individual receive as an alternative to the training described above, a copy of the Senate Workplace Harassment policy appropriate for the individual along with instructions on reporting any inappropriate behavior. For individuals who are minors, such as pages, the information shall be provided to the parent or guardian of the individual.

**Supervisors and Complaint Contacts**

Supervisors and complaint contacts shall receive additional training beyond the employee training to include instruction on handling workplace and sexual harassment complaints.
**Senators**
The annual training required of Senators pursuant to Senate Rule 1.40 shall include at least one (1) hour addressing workplace harassment, sexual harassment, undue influence, and sensitivity training. Senators shall acknowledge receipt of the training.

**Lobbyists**
Prior to lobbying in the Senate, every lobbyist shall receive a copy of this policy at the time of registration and shall sign an acknowledgment prior to completing registration that the lobbyist has read and understands the policy. For the 2018 Legislative Session, and until such time as the registration system is modified, such notification shall be accomplished by providing an electronic copy of this policy to every lobbyist registered on January 8, 2018, and every new lobbyist registering on or after that date, at the contact email address provided with the lobbyist’s registration. The notification shall include current contact information for the complaint contacts listed in this policy available to lobbyists for making a complaint.

**Third Parties**
The Senate Workplace Harassment policy and a list of complaint contacts shall be available on the Senate website under a separate link for the general public to access.

**Recordkeeping**
The Human Resources Director is the official recordkeeper for all records related to reports, notifications, complaints, and investigations under this workplace harassment policy.

**Annual Review**
The Senate commitment to providing a safe, professional environment free of workplace harassment requires continuous improvement and constant engagement at all levels. To achieve the Senate goal, this policy, and the procedures, notifications, and training provided pursuant to it, shall be reviewed at least annually and updated as necessary.
CLEVELAND ELEMENTARY SCHOOL

MURAL PAINTING DAY RESCHEDULED!

JANUARY 12th
10 AM - NOON
723 E. Hamilton Ave.

Join us as we paint a mural inspired by student Alex Tavares and interpreted by artist Junior Polo on the street in front of the school!

Refreshments and snacks will be provided.

For further information please contact torresg@plancom.org
North 62nd Street
From CSX Intermodal Entrance to North of East Columbus Drive
Financial Project ID  433071-2-52-01

Project Description:
The Florida Department of Transportation is developing plans to reconstruct a 0.44 mile segment of N. 62nd Street in Hillsborough County. Other improvements will include: addition of a 12-foot shared use path along the west side of the roadway, upgraded ADA features to meet current standards, and drainage improvements. Improvements to the intersections of N. 62nd Street/E. Broadway Avenue and N. 62nd Street/E. Columbus Drive will include larger turn radii for trucks.

Project Location:
This project is located along N. 62nd Street from the CSX Intermodal Facility Entrance to north of E. Columbus Drive in Hillsborough County.

Project Schedule:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Design</td>
<td>Phase I (December 2018)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Right-of-Way</td>
<td>Winter 2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Begin Construction</td>
<td>Spring 2022</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Project Costs:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Phase</th>
<th>Cost Estimate*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Design</td>
<td>$0.9M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Right-of-Way</td>
<td>$2.561M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction</td>
<td>$2.766M**</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Please note that cost estimates may change as the project progresses.
**Cost estimate does not include funding for CEI.

FDOT Project Manager
Charlie Xie, P.E., Project Manager
11201 N. McKinley Drive, MS 7-600
Tampa, FL 33612
Office Phone: (813) 975-6287
Charlie.Xie@dot.state.fl.us

Public Information Officer
Kristen Carson
11201 N. McKinley Drive, MS 7-110
Tampa, FL 33612
Office Phone: (813) 975-6202
Cell Phone: (813) 323-1227
kristen.carson@dot.state.fl.us
December 5, 2018

Mr. David Gwynn
District Seven Secretary
Florida Department of Transportation
11201 N. McKinley Drive
Tampa, FL 33612-6403

Dear Secretary Gwynn,

Re: Comments on Strategic Intermodal System 2045 Cost Feasible Plan

Thank you for the opportunity to provide comments on the Strategic Intermodal System (SIS) 2045 Cost Feasible Plan (CFP). The Hillsborough Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO) appreciates the Department’s continued partnership supporting mobility in greater Tampa and the region.

The MPO considers the I-275 State Road 60/Memorial Interchange (#3506) to be a top priority and essential to the continued economic vitality of the region. Due to the importance of this project, the MPO is requesting the advancement of construction funding. Waiting until after 2029 to reconstruct this interchange will greatly prolong the delays caused by this major regional bottleneck, which already is a major contributor to the low travel-time-reliability scores on interstate highways in our county. We’re also looking forward to the project improving circulation in the Westshore Business District, one of the largest business districts in the southeast U.S., by reconnecting three important local/collector roads. Finally, implementing the interchange project concurrent with the Howard Frankland bridge replacement could help lessen community impact by shortening the duration of construction.

Additional comments include:

- **I-75 at Big Bend (#3280):** We appreciate your advancement of funds to accelerate this project in the tentative work program. This interchange is a Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) Priority of the MPO as well as a high priority of the Hillsborough County Commission.

- **I-75 at Gibsonton Dr (#3281):** The MPO requests to accelerate this project, to ease congestion and increase safety at the interchange. The project is a current TIP Priority of the MPO.

- **SR 60 from Dover Rd to Polk County line (#3290, 3293):** This project is not included in the 2040 Long Range Transportation Plan, and there are priorities of higher concern. We request that the Department provide the rationale for widening this segment in rural eastern Hillsborough County, outside the urban services area.
• US 41 from Pendola Point Rd to S of Causeway Blvd (#1782): Though the need for this project is documented in the Hillsborough + Polk Freight Logistics Zone Strategic Plan, adopted by the MPO and Hillsborough County in 2017, the Hillsborough County Comprehensive Plan a number of years ago designated this segment as a constrained road. FDOT will need to work with Hillsborough County staff and the Planning Commission to amend this designation in the comprehensive plan.

We look forward to your response, and to working with you to continue to advance important improvements for our community.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

Beth Alden, AICP
Executive Director
December 5, 2018

Interim Secretary Erik Fenniman
Florida Department of Transportation
605 Suwannee Street
Tallahassee, FL 32399-0450

RE: Westshore Interchange (I-275/SR 60) Reconstruction

Dear Interim Secretary Fenniman:

This letter expresses our full support for the Westshore Interchange (I-275/SR 60) reconstruction project, which is part of a long-standing plan to improve and modernize Tampa’s interstate system.

The proposed reconstruction is prioritized for funding in the Imagine 2040 Long Range Transportation Plan and in the shorter-term priority list for the Hillsborough MPO Transportation Improvement Program. It is also an important priority for the greater region, prioritized by the TBARTA MPO Chairs’ Coordinating Committee and the Tampa Bay Transportation Management Area Leadership Group.

The Westshore Business District, where the project is located, is one of Florida’s largest economic centers, and the location of Tampa International Airport. Traffic from around the region converges at Westshore’s I-275/SR60 interchange. With the recent I-275 widening between Westshore and Downtown Tampa, the expansion of the Veterans Expressway, and the upcoming reconstruction of the Howard Frankland Bridge, traffic demand through this lynchpin interchange is continuing to grow.

Improving the interchange is essential to our city’s and region’s continued economic vitality. Lacking the reconstruction, the escalating traffic on both I-275 and the Veterans Expressway has resulted in daily bottlenecks at the interchange and dangerous back-ups on the Howard Frankland Bridge. The proposed improvements will both improve travel time reliability and increase safety.

Further development of the project design will provide the detailed information necessary to mark this as a signature project for the region and state. We request that FDOT provide full funding to address this critical priority as soon as possible.

Sincerely,

Commissioner Lesley "Les" Miller, Jr.
Chair, Hillsborough MPO
December 18, 2018

Ms. Beth Alden, AICP
Executive Director
Hillsborough MPO
601 E. Kennedy Blvd
18th Floor
Tampa, FL 33602

Re: Strategic Intermodal System (SIS) Highway Component 2045 Cost Feasible Plan

Dear Ms. Alden:

Thank you for reviewing and providing comments on the Draft Strategic Intermodal System (SIS) Highway Component 2045 Cost Feasible Plan. Below are responses to the comments provided to us.

- I-275 SR60/Memorial Interchange (#3506) – The comments of support for this project is greatly appreciated. This project is a top priority for the Florida Department of Transportation (FDOT) and we are working to advance this project as early as possible.

- I-75 at Big Bend (#3280) – The opportunity to advance this project is a great example of the MPO, Hillsborough County, and FDOT working together, and we look forward to this project becoming a reality. This project is currently a design build project scheduled to begin construction in 2021/2022 (FPN# 424513-3).

- I-75 at Gibsonton Dr (#3281) – The Department has this project on its projects to advance list and will continue to look for funding opportunities as soon as possible. (FPN# 437650-2).

- SR 60 from Dover Rd to Polk County Line (#3290, #3293) – SR 60 is one of the most strategic corridors in Florida serving as a major east-west corridor. The traffic volumes are projected to increase between 50% to 100% through this segment by 2040. The Department is willing to review our needs based on the updated socio-economic data projections from the long-range plan update process.

www.fdot.gov
• US 41 from Fendola Point Rd to S of Causeway Blvd (#1782) – FDOT recognizes that this segment of US 41 is designated as a constrained road. We will be working with Hillsborough County and the Planning Commission to amend the designation in the comprehensive plan.

Thank you again for providing feedback, and being our partner in advancing critical projects in Hillsborough County.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

David Gwynn, P.E.
District Seven Secretary

cc: Ed McKinney, District Seven PLEMO Manager
    Lori Marable, District Seven SIS Coordinator
The Honorable Cindy Stuart  
School Board Member, District 3  
Hillsborough County Public Schools  
901 E. Kennedy Blvd.  
Tampa, FL 33602

Dear Mrs. Stuart:

The Florida Department of Transportation (FDOT) thanks Hillsborough County Schools for bringing their concerns regarding Chamberlain High School to our attention. Based on the suggestions from the Hillsborough County MPO's School Safety Study Final Report, dated September 2018, the following are improvements the department has implemented:

- A protected left turn for northbound and southbound drivers. (A protected left turn is a green left turn arrow for vehicles turning left, other vehicles see a red ball, thus restricting their movement.) On Busch Blvd., we also extended the walk time “Ped Protect” during school ingress/egress. (From 7:55-8:25am (M-F) and from 3:30-4:00pm (T-F) the walk time is now approx. 24 seconds.)
- On Monday in the afternoon only, for Busch Blvd., the walk time will remain at 7 seconds due to the early release schedule.
- A speed and education enforcement incentive will take place along the Busch Blvd. corridor, including near Chamberlain HS. This incentive is scheduled to start in December 2018/January 2019 and will be a cooperative effort between FDOT, law enforcement and Bike Walk Tampa Bay. The goal of this incentive will be to reduce the average speed of drivers along select corridors by five miles per hour. As part of this incentive, speed feedback signs should be installed along Busch Blvd. effective January 2019.
- Lighting along the Busch Blvd. corridor, including the area around Chamberlain HS is being upgraded to LED, in cooperation with TECO and the City of Tampa. Most of this work has been completed, and the area to the east of Chamberlain HS is expected to be completed by December.
- Educational opportunities will be provided at Chamberlain HS via Bike Walk Tampa Bay, the Teen Safe Driving Program, and the CTST Program Manager. The department will coordinate with Chamberlain HS administration on the dates of the
presentations. Our Teen Traffic Safety presenter was at Chamberlain HS on 8/16/18 and is scheduled to return on 1/15/19.

We look forward to continuing our work with Hillsborough County Schools, the City of Tampa and Hillsborough County on ways to improve safety for the students and the motoring public that use this corridor.

If you have any questions about these improvements, please feel free to contact me at ping.hsu@dot.state.fl.us or (813) 975-6251 or Ginger Regalado, Community Traffic Safety Program Manager at ginger.regalado@dot.state.fl.us or (813) 975-6970.

Sincerely,

Peter Hsu, P.E.
District Safety Program Engineer

PH:GR

CC: David Gwynn, Jamie Warrington, Brian McKishnie, Ron Chin, Brian Shroyer
December 04, 2018

Mr. Mike Merrill  
County Administrator  
Hillsborough County  
County Center  
601 East Kennedy Boulevard, Floor 26  
Tampa, FL 33602

Dear Mr. Merrill:

I want to sincerely thank you for supporting TBARTA's request for local funding from Hillsborough County for Fiscal Year 2019. As you know, your annual contribution is vital to TBARTA's continued development of a regional multi-modal transit system in Tampa Bay, as well as accessing state and federal grants that support our mission and the continued success of our partner programs and projects.

While TBARTA is still at the beginning of its new direction, as the new Executive Director since October 2018, it has been my top priority to develop the policies and strategies essential to implement a regional transit service that will link our major economic activity centers and allow both residents and visitors to travel across counties by a mode other than their personal automobile. Already, we have made strides toward establishing the financial and institutional framework that will be key to successfully delivering this service, starting with obtaining funds for what will be Tampa Bay's first Regional Transit Development Plan (RTDP). We are also preparing to begin a PD&E study for premium regional transit within the entire 41-mile corridor of I-275 from St. Petersburg to Wesley Chapel. TBARTA is in the procurement phase for both projects and plans to engage its partner counties and respective agencies throughout their development, anticipated to begin in early 2019.

Building on our past recent achievements, which were enclosed with our request letter earlier this year, TBARTA will also continue to grow its successful Commuter Services Program, which saved last year alone over 2.5 million trips, translating into over 25 million vehicle miles, 950,000 parking spaces, and $10.9 million saved in commuting costs across the five counties in the Florida Department of Transportation District 7 area.

Thank you again for your support, and I look forward to updating you with our accomplishments for 2019. If you have questions, please feel free to contact me.

Sincerely,

David Green  
Executive Director

cc: Commissioner Pat Kemp, Hillsborough County  
   Mayor Bob Buckhorn, City of Tampa, TBARTA Board  
   Kathleen Shanahan, HART Board, TBARTA Board  
   Secretary David Gwynn, Florida Department of Transportation, District 7  
   Beth Alden, Hillsborough County MPO Executive Director
TBARTA Updated Accomplishments

- TBARTA successfully obtained $1,000,000 from the Florida Legislature to develop the Tampa Bay region's first Regional Transit Development Plan (RTDP) and is in the procurement phase for consultant(s). The RTDP will identify opportunities for investment for regional transit service and/or infrastructure on a 10-year horizon for the five-county region.

- The TBARTA Regional Vanpool program was expanded from 118 vans in June 2018 to 136 as of this letter.

- The Regional School Commute program was expanded from 123 to 128 schools, alleviating congestion, improving the health of students, and allowing more time for teachers to focus on what they do best – teaching.
  - The innovative public-private partnership with the mobile application company PikMyKid, offering schools the opportunity to pilot the company’s transportation safety software free for the first year, grew to include three schools.

- The Metropolitan Planning Organization Regional Coordination and Best Practices study, which focuses on improving the results of regional planning cooperation in Tampa Bay, is nearing its conclusion with the completion of research and two multi-county workshops. Results will be presented to the MPOs of Pinellas, Pasco and Hillsborough for additional feedback in January 2019 prior to finalizing the recommendations of the report.

- Continued support of transit technologies with funding for Flamingo Fares as well as completion of research on region-wide implementation of the OneBusAway mobile app and updates to the One Call-One Click myRIDE program.

- Continued regional planning coordination with the TBARTA Chairs Coordinating Committee (TBARTA MPOs CCC) to prioritize transportation projects for state and federal funding.

“A world class transit system that connects and moves the Tampa Bay region”
- TBARTA Vision Statement
December 27, 2018

Ms. Sarah Abel
Program Manager for Complete Street
Institute of Transportation Engineers

Dear Ms. Abel,

The Tampa Bay Area has the unfortunate distinction of being a community with some of the highest traffic injuries and deaths in the U.S. We have worked together, across county boundaries, to bring attention to these avoidable crashes. In February 2018, we held the first ever Gulf Coast Safe Streets summit that brought together professionals and advocates, including renowned speakers from around the country, to encourage the implementation of complete streets that are safe and accessible for all.

With growing attention to the relationship between speed and crash severity, we must address the way roadways are designed and speed limits determined in Tampa Bay. The Hillsborough MPO’s Vision Zero Action Plan specifically lists a goal to update policies, standards and procedures to foster a culture of safety in the planning and design of the transportation system. Hosting the Road to Zero Speed Management Training Workshop is exactly what we need to do next.

Many thanks for your consideration of this opportunity.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

Commissioner Lesley “Les” Miller, Jr.
Chair Hillsborough MPO
Hillsborough Board of County Commissioners

Plan Hillsborough
planhillsborough.org
planner@planhillsborough.org
813 - 272 - 5940
601 E Kennedy Blvd
18th Floor
Tampa, FL, 33602
Unfortunately we had the highest two week period of fatal crashes with 19 people dying on our roads. Over 75%, or 15, were vulnerable road users. These included six pedestrians and nine (!) motorcyclists.

Ron Chin provided the following information:

The leading cause of motorcycle crashes is attributed to opposing vehicular traffic making left-turns. Motorcycles have a small footprint and tend to travel faster than perceived by many vehicular drivers. If you cannot determine how far away a motorcycle is; please, just wait and let it pass before you turn. A few seconds can make a difference to save a life. The department’s motorcycle coalition works diligently to educate our citizens. To learn more, please visit the [www.RideSmartFlorida.com](http://www.RideSmartFlorida.com)

We are in the time of year where daylight is the shortest. Please watch out for vulnerable road users. Thank you for all you do.

**David W. Gwynn, P.E.**
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November 5, 2018

Charles M. Frietsch, 65, Riverview: Charles was traveling eastbound on Gibsonton Drive at the intersection of Park Place Avenue under a green light, when a vehicle tried to turn left from Gibsonton Drive onto Park Place Avenue and entered the path of his motorcycle. Charles collided with the right side of the vehicle and was ejected from his motorcycle. He was transported to Tampa General Hospital where he later died from his injuries. Charles is survived by his wife, sons, brother, sister, grandchildren, and great-grandchildren.

Charlie Suave Garcia, 28, Orlando: Charlie was stopped in the painted gore of northbound I-75 at the exit ramp to Gibsonton Drive. A vehicle changed lanes traveling across the painted gore at the exit ramp and collided with Charlie’s motorcycle. He suffered fatal injuries at the scene of the crash. Charlie is survived by his parents, sister, brother, family, and friends.

November 6, 2018

George Fletcher Ball, 64, St. Petersburg: George was crossing 34th Street North while pushing a wheelchair and stopped on the median. However, he then placed the wheelchair in the northbound traffic lane. A vehicle that was northbound on 34th Street North swerved to avoid the wheelchair, but his trailer struck it and pushed it into George. He was transported to Bayfront Health St. Petersburg where he later died from his injuries. George is survived by sister, brother, family and friends.

Francis Robert Hass, 86: Francis was crossing 30th Avenue North at 31st Street, when a pickup truck struck him. He was transported to a hospital, where he later died from his injuries.

William Delapp, 87, Zephyrhills: William was riding his motorcycle eastbound on Morris Bridge Road at the intersection of the on-ramp to I-75. A vehicle that was turning left onto the I-75 on-ramp from Morris Bridge Road failed to yield to William and struck the motorcycle, ejecting him. William suffered critical injuries and subsequently died on November 8th. He was a veteran of the U.S. Army and was a City of Oswego firefighter. William is survived by his children, siblings, grandchildren, great-grandchildren, family, and friends.
November 10, 2018

Christopher Wade Mayo, 28, Lithia: Christopher was traveling westbound on Keysville Road East, just east of Lupton Place without his headlight on. A vehicle that was eastbound on Keysville Road East made a left turn to go in his residence and did not see Christopher. Christopher lost control of the motorcycle trying to avoid a crash. He suffered fatal injuries at the scene. He enjoyed the outdoors, hunting, fishing, and motorcycles. He is survived by his wife, children, father, mother, siblings, and family.

November 11, 2018

John Howard Perry, 71, Lutz: John was walking westbound across the southbound lanes of Dale Mabry Highway when he entered the path of a vehicle. As a result, the vehicle collided with John, causing him to suffer fatal injuries at the scene of the crash.

November 12, 2018

Sam Bellotte, 66, Tarpon Springs: Sam was riding his motorcycle west on MLK Jr. Boulevard. At the intersection with US 19, a vehicle ran the red light and struck Sam. He suffered life threatening injuries in the crash and died while he was being transported to Bayonet Point Medical Center. He enjoyed spending time with his grandchildren and riding his motorcycle. He is survived by his daughter, parents, siblings, grandchildren, and family.

Michael Richardson, 55: Michael was placing his bicycle on the bike rack of a PSTA bus, which was heading southbound on Gulf Boulevard which was stopped at a designated bus stop, south of 4th Ave. A vehicle traveling northbound on Gulf Boulevard traveled into the wrong lane, striking the bus head-on. Michael was transported to Bayfront Medical Center, where he later died from his injuries.

Jack Martin Tashjian, 59, Daytona Beach: Jack was walking westbound across 49th Street North, just north of 58th Avenue North, when he walked into the path of northbound traffic and was struck by a vehicle. Jack was transported to Northside Hospital where he later died from his injuries.

Deborah Deliz Sandoval, 23, Plant City: Deborah was traveling eastbound on Sparkman Road when she lost control of the vehicle. The vehicle crossed the center line, ran off the roadway to the left, slid through multiple ditches and culverts along the north side of the roadway and struck multiple mailboxes. The vehicle came to a final rest after striking a wooden utility pole. Deborah was pronounced deceased at the scene. Deborah is survived by her parents, siblings, family and friends.

November 15, 2018

Nobuaki Okuhara, 47, Seminole: Nobuaki was traveling westbound on Park Boulevard in the 7500 block. For an unknown reason, he lost control of the vehicle which spun on the wet road and first struck a chain link fence and then a power pole on the north side of Park Boulevard. Nobuaki was taken to hospital where he later died from his injuries.
**Christopher Sierra**, 44, St. Petersburg: Christopher was riding a motorcycle south on 31st Street North. A northbound vehicle attempted to make a left turn onto 3rd Avenue North and turned into Christopher’s path, who swerved to avoid the collision. As a result, he was thrown from the motorcycle. Christopher was transported to a local hospital, where he later died from his injuries.

**November 16, 2018**

**Armando Lopez, 43, Plant City**: Armando was walking along the south shoulder of Sammonds Road on his way to work when he was hit by a vehicle that was fleeing from the police. He suffered fatal injuries at the scene of the crash. Armando is survived by his parents, brothers, sister, family, and friends.

**November 17, 2018**

**Jesse Lamar Wood, 25, Plant City**: Jesse was traveling westbound on SR 60 at Limona Road, when he crashed into the back of a Hillsborough County Sheriff's Vehicle. After the crash, he fled the scene and traveled north on Limona Street. He lost control of his vehicle as he crossed the railroad grade north of Victoria Street and the vehicle rolled over onto its side. Jesse died at the scene. He loved his family and friends, and enjoyed fishing. He is survived by his mother, father, sister, family, and friends.

**November 18, 2018**

**Andrew Albert Bundrant, 32, Hudson**: Andrew was traveling southbound on Kitten Trail approaching Little Pete Road. For unknown reasons, he lost control of his vehicle, departed the roadway and struck a fence on the west shoulder of the road. The vehicle continued, collided with a tree and overturned, ejecting Andrew. Andrew died at the Bayonet Point Hospital where he was taken after the crash. He is survived by his daughter, mother, siblings, family, and friends.

**Dustin Shawn Hogan, 31, New Port Richey**: Dustin was traveling westbound on Embassy Boulevard. At the intersection of Palm Avenue, an eastbound vehicle turned left into the path of his motorcycle. As a result, Dustin collided with the passenger side of the vehicle, causing him to be ejected from the motorcycle. He was transported to Regional Medical Center Bayonet Point where he later died from his injuries. He is survived by his fiance, daughter, parents, sisters, and grandparents.

**Gregory Allen Kubitz, 31, Palmetto**: Gregory was riding a motorcycle south on Howard Frankland Bridge, near the center span hump and was behind a vehicle that was pulling a trailer. He tried to pass the vehicle at a high rate of speed but hit the trailer. Gregory was transported to Bayfront Medical Center where he later died from his injuries.

**Jacquelyn Kay Lindemann, 33, Kihei**: Jacquelyn was passenger of a motorcycle traveling eastbound on I-4, west of Branch Forbes Road near mile marker 16. For unknown reasons, she fell off the motorcycle and was struck by a vehicle when she was laying in the roadway. She suffered fatal injuries at the scene of the crash.
During the latest two week period 11 people died on our roads in District 7. Seven of the 11 were vulnerable road users including three pedestrians, three motorcyclists, and one ATV driver. Of the four people who died in car crashes, three were related to stolen vehicle fleeing police at high speeds and the other involved a speeding truck that hit a car and killed one of the occupants. Speed kills, so please observe the posted speed limits, especially in areas with lots of vulnerable users. Ron Chin provided the following message which I agree with completely:

This time of year we are all preparing for and embracing the holiday season spending quality time with friends and family. Let us remind others in such preparations to keep focus on the road; remember to remain vigilant for safety and don’t become distracted while driving - those moments can make a difference.

“AAA forecasts more than one-third of Americans will travel this holiday season, with approximately 102 million people expected to pack up their cars for road trips. This is 4.4% higher than last year and the most since AAA began tracking holiday travel in 2001.”

Travel safely and as you enjoy the festivities that come with the holiday season - please do so responsibly!

Please have a safe holiday time and be safe, we need all of you back for 2019!

David W. Gwynn, P.E.
District Seven Secretary
Florida Department of Transportation
11201 N. McKinley Drive
Tampa, FL 33612
813-975-6039
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November 18, 2018 (Delayed)

James Reid Butler, 27, Lakewood Ranch: James who had been missing since November 17th was found dead by highway maintenance workers almost two weeks later along I-275 in St. Petersburg. On November 18th, James was traveling southbound on I-275 approaching 54th Avenue South. For unknown reasons, he departed the roadway and entered the grass median where the motorcycle overturned and collided with several trees. Upon impact, he was ejected from the motorcycle and suffered fatal injuries at the scene of the crash. He is survived by his parents, girlfriend, family and friends.

November 19, 2018

Sheng Hui Lin, 28, Brandon: An Uber was requested at a restaurant in Brooksville to pick up Sheng, who was intoxicated at that time. When he was in transit to his residence he became agitated and exited the vehicle before it came to a complete stop. Sheng then stepped into the adjacent travel lane of I-75 and was struck by two vehicles. He was transported to Tampa General Hospital where he later died from his injuries.

Damari Milton, 18, St. Petersburg; Dequante Lightsey, 16, St. Petersburg:
Damari was the driver and Dequante was the passenger of a stolen car, traveling westbound at a high rate of speed on 38th Avenue North. As they were approaching 49th Street North, Damari lost control, swerved off the road and hit a tree. The car immediately burst into flames, causing both teens to die at the scene of the crash. Damari is survived by his parents, siblings and family. Dequante is survived by his parents, siblings and family.

Hailey Marie Mullen, 20, Pinellas Park: Hailey was passenger in a car driven by her grandmother, traveling eastbound on 102nd Avenue North. At the intersection of 97th Street North, they turned left under a green traffic signal and were struck on the passenger side by two speeding trucks. Hailey died at the scene of the crash. Hailey was in college studying to be a teacher for the visually impaired.

November 21, 2018

William Paul Hatch, 44, Crystal River: William was traveling northbound on West Peking Court, a dirt trail, when he lost control of the ATV for unknown reasons. The ATV overturned, William was ejected and suffered fatal injuries at the scene of the crash.
November 22, 2018

Jerry Dickens, 26: Jerry was crossing at the 100 block of 3rd Street North, when he was hit by a vehicle. He was transported to Bayfront Health St. Petersburg, where he later died on November 27th from injuries sustained in the crash.

November 24, 2018

Yalanda Treece Speights, 46, St. Petersburg: Yalanda was passenger in a car driven by her mother as they were heading home from shopping. They were traveling on 18th Avenue South, ready to turn north onto 25th Street South, where they collided with a stolen car. Post impact, all four people in the stolen vehicle tried to flee the scene on foot, but they were arrested. Yalanda died Saturday, one week later, from injuries she sustained in the crash. She enjoyed painting. Yalanda was a member of Creative Clay for sixteen years, which serves adults with disabilities through the arts. Yalanda is survived by her mother, brother, family and friends.

November 27, 2018

Eric Anthony Parisi, 17, Spring Hill: Eric was riding a motorcycle south on Mariner Boulevard, approaching the red traffic signal at Northcliffe Boulevard. A vehicle traveling northbound on Mariner Boulevard made a left turn across the southbound lanes as Eric failed to stop at the red traffic signal. As a result, the front of the motorcycle collided with the right side of the vehicle. Eric suffered fatal injuries at the scene of the crash. He was a high school senior, was in band and volunteered to take photos at school. Eric is survived by his parents, brother, grandparents and family.

November 30, 2018

Nayomi Ramos-Perez, 20, Waterbury: Nayomi was walking east across US 301, north of Duncan Road, when she stepped into the path of a northbound pickup truck. She died at Tampa General Hospital where she was taken after the crash.

December 1, 2018

Ronald C. Sampson, 27, Fort Meade: Ronald was traveling westbound on SR 60, east of Horton Road at a high rate of speed. A cargo van was turning left from southbound Horton Road onto eastbound SR 60. The van entered the path of Ronald’s motorcycle and they collided. The motorcycle caught fire and Ronald suffered fatal injuries at the scene of the crash.
This will be the final bi-weekly report sent out in 2018. We lost eleven people on our roads during the two week period, with five being vulnerable road users (four pedestrians and one motorcyclist). Of the four pedestrians, three were hit and run crashes. All six of the vehicle crashes involved drivers leaving the roadway (lane departure crashes). It is hard to tell what caused the lane departure crashes, but please be alert as you drive, avoid drinking and driving, and also avoid distracted driving.

Peter Hsu tells me that although preliminary annual fatalities nationwide and in Florida appear to be similar for 2018 compared to 2017, it also looks like District 7 may see a double digit reduction, which would be another step towards zero fatalities.

Please be safe this New Years holiday. It is estimated that nationally there will be 438 fatalities and over 50,000 injuries over the long weekend.
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December 3, 2018

Miguel Alexis Hernandez Jr., 21, Plant City: Miguel was walking eastbound on SR 574 after leaving Fuego Bar & Grille with two other men when they were struck by a vehicle traveling eastbound. The vehicle continued to travel eastbound after the collision. Law enforcement are still looking for the hit and run driver. Miguel died at the scene of the crash. Miguel is survived by his parents, brother, sisters, family, and friends.

Veronica Collins, 64, Sun City: Veronica was found in the 1900 block of Sterling Glen Court. For unknown reasons her vehicle traveled off the roadway and entered a pond near the Caloosa Golf and Country Club. Veronica was found dead at the scene of the crash. Veronica is survived by family and friends.

December 4, 2018

Shawn Clement, 59, Tarpon Springs: Shawn was walking southbound across Flora Avenue east of Brightwell Drive when she was struck by a vehicle that fled the scene. Law enforcement officers are still looking for the hit and run driver. Shawn was transported to Florida Hospital of North Pinellas, where she later died from her injuries. Shawn is survived by family and friends.

December 5, 2018

Richard Eugene Duignan, 56, Tampa: Richard was riding a motorcycle westbound on I-4, west of McIntosh Road, when he attempted to overtake another vehicle. Richard collided with the utility trailer being towed by the other vehicle. Richard died at the scene of the crash. Richard is survived by family and friends.

December 6, 2018

Felicia Wilkerson, 57, Seminole: Felicia was crossing Seminole Boulevard near 61st Avenue North, in a poorly lit segment and outside of a crosswalk, when she was struck by a vehicle traveling southbound. Felicia was transported to Bayfront Hospital St. Petersburg, where she later died from injuries. Felicia is survived by family and friends.
December 7, 2018

**Marilyn Frances Martin**, 71, Largo: Marilyn was traveling eastbound on Walsingham Road when she entered the intersection under a red light. Marilyn’s vehicle collided with a vehicle traveling southbound, causing both vehicles to be propelled into a third vehicle. Marilyn died at the scene of the crash. Marilyn is survived by family and friends.

December 8, 2018

**Jose Luis Jimenez Jr., 35, Land O’ Lakes**: Jose was a passenger in a vehicle traveling east on Chancey Road when, for unknown reasons, the car left the roadway and struck a tree. Jose and the driver had been drinking and he was not wearing a seatbelt. Jose was taken to St. Joseph’s Hospital where he later died from his injuries. Jose was the owner and operator of Vallarta’s Mexican Restaurant in Lutz. Jose is survived by his wife, children, brothers, sister, family, and friends.

December 14, 2018

**Gerald Leon Sellas**, 60, Hudson: Gerald was driving east on SR 52 when, for unknown reasons, he traveled across the center median into the westbound lanes. Gerald then collided head on with another vehicle. Gerald was taken to Regional Medical Center Bayonet Point where he later died from his injuries. Gerald is survived by family and friends.

**Joel Cameron Pelton**, 21, Inverness: Joel was driving east on West Cardinal Street near the intersection of South Kirk Point when, for unknown reasons, he lost control of his vehicle. Joel’s vehicle rotated counter-clockwise into the westbound lane and collided with the passenger side of a westbound vehicle. Joel was transported to Regional Medical Center Bayonet Point in Hudson where he later died from his injuries. Joel is survived by his parents, brother, grandmother, step-siblings, family and friends.

December 15, 2018

**Charles Edward Kinsey**, 46, Tampa: Charles was a pedestrian that was struck while walking on Fowler Avenue near Hoyt Avenue. Law enforcement say that Charles was dead when they arrived at the scene and they are still looking for information on the hit and run driver. Charles is survived by family and friends.

**Joel Lopez Mendez**, 26, Wimauma: Joel was returning from a fishing trip with his family in a vehicle traveling along CR 39 when, for unknown reasons, the driver of the vehicle drifted off the roadway. The vehicle hit a mailbox, returned to the road, then departed the roadway again and crashed into a tree. Joel died at the scene of the crash. Joel is survived by family and friends.